DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 734	UD 022 174
TITLE	ESEA Title I Evaluation, Fiscal 1980: Activity Reports, Volume 1 and Volume 2: Statistical Tables.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 81
NOTE	509p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC21 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Bilingual Education; Career Guidance; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; *Mathematics Achievement; Mathematics Instruction; Parent Participation; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; *Reading Achievement; Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Chicago Public Schools IL; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This is a two-volume evaluation report on the effectiveness of 55 Title I activities implemented during fiscal year 1980 in the Chicago (Illinois) Public Schools. The activities include reading and mathematics laboratory and pull-out programs, self contained and individualized programs, and programs serving special needs. Volume 1 ranks each activity on general effectiveness in improving pupils' cognitive growth as measured by standardized tests; makes recommendations for activity continuation, modification, or deletion; and provides a narrative evaluation of each activity. Each evaluation narrative describes (1) specific program activities; (2) organization and management; (3) instructional components; (4) pupil achievement; (5) cost effectiveness; and (6) conclusions and recommendations. Volume 2 presents tables of statistical data on pupil achievement in 53 of the programs, as indicated by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Information is provided only for those pupils known to have participated for at least 8 months in the same Title I activity at the same school. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223734

UD022174

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND LONG RANGE PLANNING

Bureau of ESEA Program Evaluation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Schuster
Chicago Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION--FISCAL 1980:
ACTIVITY REPORTS
Volume 1

Dr. Ruth B. Love
General Superintendent of Schools
Board of Education of the City of Chicago

May 1981

vol 2

ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION--FISCAL 1980:

ACTIVITY REPORTS

Volume 1

Dr. Ruth B. Love
General Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Irving M. Brauer
Director of Projects
Department of Research, Evaluation and Long Range Planning

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, handicaps unrelated to ability, or sex in its educational program or employment policies or practices.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. Raul A. Villalobos, President
Mrs. Martha J. Jantho, Vice-President

Mrs. Betty Bonow
Mr. Sol Brandzel
Mr. Edwin Claudio
Mr. John D. Foster
Prof. Joyce A. Hughes
Mrs. Rose Mary Janus
Dr. Wilfred Reid
Dr. Luis Salces
Dr. Kenneth B. Smith

Dr. Ruth B. Love
General Superintendent of Schools

The activities evaluated in this report were funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and administered through the Department of Government Funded Programs.

The coordinators evaluating the activities are named in their respective activity narratives. In addition, appreciation is extended to the following Bureau of ESEA Program Evaluation staff for their assistance in the preparation of this publication: Arie J. vanderPloeg, Mavis Hagemann, and Marcia Kurland.

Appreciation is also extended to other Department of Research, Evaluation and Long Range Planning staff who provided technical, clerical, and supportive assistance.

Frederick A. Schuster, Director
Bureau of ESEA Program Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction v
Recommendations ix
Activity Rankings and Summaries of Pupil Achievement xv

EVALUATION NARRATIVES

READING LABORATORY ACTIVITIES

Computer-Assisted Instruction 1-1
Programmed Reading Instructional System . . . 2-1
Language Arts Reinforcement Center 3-1
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Reading 4-1
Improving Reading Achievement through the Teaching of Typewriting 5-1
Hoffman's ME-dia System 6-1
System 80 Program 7-1
Prescription Learning 8-1
High Intensity Centers 9-1
Multimedia Audiovisual Readiness Kindergarten Program 10-1
New Century Basic Skills 11-1

READING PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES

Teaching Reading Skills through Drama . . . 12-1
An Eclectic Approach to Corrective and Remedial Reading Instruction 13-1
Behavioral Research Laboratories/ Sullivan Reading Program 14-1
Scott, Foresman Reading System 15-1
Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program 16-1
Open Court Remedial Reading Program 17-1
EMC Corporation/Schmerler: Phonetic/ Linguistic Reading and Language Program . 18-1
BFA Comprehension/Vocabulary Program 19-1
SRA Corrective Reading Program 20-1
Support Systems for Individualized Reading . 21-1
Language in Transition 22-1
Home Visiting Instruction Team 23-1
Teaching Reading through Literature with the Newbery Award Series 24-1

SELF-CONTAINED ACTIVITIES

A Kindergarten and Primary Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing 25-1
An Intermediate and Upper Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing 26-1
Encyclopaedia Britannica's Language Experiences in Reading. 27-1
Crane Reading System 28-1
DISTAR Program in Reading and Language . . . 29-1
Early Intervention: A Preschool and Kindergarten Activity 30-1
Early Childhood Education 31-1
Instructional Team Schools 32-1
Child-Parent Centers 33-1
Follow Through 34-1

MATHEMATICS LABORATORY AND PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES

Mathematics Laboratory for the Development of Computational Skills 35-1
Alternative Instructional Mathematics System 36-1
Individualized Mathematics Instruction: An Eclectic Approach to Remedial Mathematics Instruction 37-1
Individualized Mathematics Instruction: Wynroth Math Program 38-1
Pre-Algebra Development Centers 39-1
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Mathematics 40-1

ACTIVITIES SERVING SPECIAL NEEDS

Career Guidance Laboratory 41-1
Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading 42-1
Bilingual Education Multimedia Instruction . 43-1
Basic Occupational and Skill Training 44-1
Guidance for Title I Elementary School Pupils 45-1
Family Guidance Center 46-1
Field Experiences 47-1
Outdoor Education and Camping 48-1
Health Services 49-1
School-Community Identification 50-1
Parent Plus Project 51-1
Institute for Parent Involvement 52-1
Staff Development through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist 53-1
New Educational Directions 54-1
Educational Leadership Institute 55-1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of Title I evaluation

Each year the Department of Research, Evaluation and Long Range Planning evaluates the implementation and the educational effectiveness of the Title I project overall, of each activity, and of the activities at each participating school. The primary purposes of this evaluation are:

- to assess the adequacy of the implementation of the various Title I activities by the schools and to describe the activities in the form they were implemented;
- to obtain measures of the evaluation objectives specified for each activity, to determine if the objectives were met, and to identify strengths and weaknesses of the Title I activities;
- to draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding the continuation of activities and identify programmatic changes which would result in improved instruction and learning in Title I classes.

The first priority of the annual evaluation is to provide to each participating school indicators of the instructional effectiveness of the activities it operated. To meet this priority, each school has been presented with summaries of achievement data for those of its pupils who participated in Title I activities. These summaries are contained in the document entitled ESEA Title I Evaluation--Fiscal 1980: School Reports. Similar reports have been distributed to District Superintendents and Department of Government Funded Programs administrators.

The second priority is to evaluate the effectiveness of each activity. This document speaks to that priority. It ranks each activity in terms of its general effectiveness in improving pupils' cognitive growth as measured by standardized tests; makes recommendations for activity continuation, modification, or deletion from the Title I project in Chicago; provides a narrative evaluation of each activity; and presents the aggregated achievement results for each activity.

The objectives against which schools and activities were evaluated appear in the Research and Evaluation narrative in Reading: Top Priority, Fiscal 1980. That narrative also details the general methods and procedures used in the evaluation.

Instruments used in the evaluation

The evaluation used a variety of instruments to collect information. The standardized tests, participant identification forms, staff questionnaires, and observational instruments used are described below.

Standardized achievement tests

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills assess Title I pupils' cognitive growth. Test scores are obtained during the annual citywide testing period. Results from this battery are used to evaluate the progress of pupils in age cycles seven to fifteen.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills measure the achievement of Title I pupils in age cycles five and six. This test is administered at the time of Citywide Testing to Title I pupils only. A posttest-only design is used.

The Chicago EARLY Assessment is used for preschool pupils. This instrument identifies specific skill areas in which a child may be deficient. It is administered to all Title I preschool pupils at the beginning of the academic year. At the end of the academic year, those children who displayed low scores in particular skill areas in the fall are retested in those areas in which possible deficiencies were noted.

Participant identification

The ESEA Title I Enrollment Form was distributed to classroom or adjustment teachers in the fall and spring. It identified each pupil participating in Title I, in which activities the pupil was enrolled, his or her birthdate, attendance, CPML levels in reading and mathematics, ILP status, etc. This form was used to link pupil and test score data, to provide the count of the number of pupils participating in each activity, to check on the preparation and use of ILPs, etc.

Classroom observations

Two classroom observation forms were used in the fall of fiscal 1980: one for preschool activities and one for regular classroom instruction. Both recorded basic characteristics of each room such as class size, grouping patterns, the number of adults present, and the reasons for cancellation if no class was being conducted at the time the observation was scheduled. The actual observation recorded the patterns of teacher behavior, pupil behavior, and pupil-teacher interaction. At least one classroom of each Title I activity at each school was observed. Most classes were observed at least twice.

In the spring of fiscal 1980 a second round of observations was conducted using a revised instrument. Again, at least one classroom of each Title I activity at each school was observed.

The information obtained from the observations provided indicators of the typical pupil and teacher behavior patterns for each activity. These patterns may be contrasted among activities and compared to the ideal instructional patterns specified in the activity descriptions or indicated by program vendors.

The observers also maintained anecdotal records of their observations and other visits to Title I schools and activity rooms. These records added insights into the conduct and implementation of activities at each school.

Teaching Staff Questionnaires

The Title I Teacher Questionnaire and Title I Teacher Aide Questionnaire, distributed in the spring of fiscal 1980, gave the teaching staff an opportunity to present their perspectives on the conduct and effectiveness of Title I activities. Teachers and aides were asked to state how frequently they attended inservice meetings and to rate the quality of the presentations, to indicate the frequency with which they performed certain tasks associated with Title I instruction, to evaluate parent participation in their activity, and to judge how well their activity served their pupils. The teacher aides were also asked about their relationships with their teachers. All Title I funded teachers and teacher aides were asked to complete questionnaires.

A Non-Title I Teacher Questionnaire was administered to a sample of board-funded teachers who sent pupils to Title I laboratory or pull-out classes. This questionnaire obtained the regular teachers' responses to Title I participation, in particular to such issues as: improved pupil learning because of participation in Title I, communication and coordination with Title I teachers, preparation of ILPs, and possible disturbances to the regular program of instruction caused by pupils departing for Title I classes.

For several activities special staff questionnaires were distributed. These included questionnaires for CAI teacher aides, school-community representatives, coordinators in the Instructional Laboratories activity, parent-resource teachers attached to the Institute for Parent Involvement activity, reading resource specialists provided in the Staff Development through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist activity, teachers leading outings in the Field Experiences activity, and staff assigned to conduct the

Outdoor Education and Camping, Health Services, and the Parent Plus Project activities.

Principal interviews and evaluation forms

In the fall of fiscal 1980 principals of Title I schools were interviewed. The questions asked by the interviewers covered a variety of issues: Why were particular Title I activities chosen? What were the reasons for delayed implementation of activities? Who participated in the selection of Title I activities? How were pupils chosen to participate? In addition, principals were asked to express their general views of Title I.

In the spring of fiscal 1980 each principal was asked to respond to the Principal's Evaluation Form. On this form the principals rated the quality of each activity with respect to meeting instructional objectives, staff, inservices, materials, equipment, and vendor services.

Parent questionnaire

A questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of parents of pupils participating in Title I instructional activities late in the spring of fiscal 1980. The questionnaires were returned anonymously. Parents were asked if they approved of their children's Title I activities, if they had visited the activity room and teacher, if they had seen improvement in their children because of participation in Title I, and the like.

Other information sources

In addition to the instruments described above, such sources as teacher and school records, pupil status cards, health team records, inservice logs, telephone surveys and interviews, and personal observations were used to complete the evaluation.

Data interpretation and conclusions

Computerized analyses and hand-tabulation of open-ended responses and incidental comments were conducted on all these data. The results were interpreted by staff skilled in data analysis and thoroughly familiar with all aspects of Title I activities. The final judgments rendered on each activity in this report are based on a collation and analysis of these data, tempered by the knowledge and experience of the staff responsible for the individual evaluation narratives.

12

RECOMMENDATIONS

The tables which follow make one of five recommendations for each Title I activity in use in fiscal 1980. The possible recommendations are:

1. This Title I activity has been assessed to be very effective in improving instruction and pupil achievement and is recommended for use in Title I schools and in the Chicago public schools generally.

2. This Title I activity has been assessed to be effective in meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for selection by schools seeking to replace activities not producing the desired results or not meeting school needs.

3. This Title I activity has been assessed to be capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation at those schools where it is producing the desired effects or meeting school needs.

4. This Title I activity, as currently implemented, has been assessed to be occasionally capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population at particular schools. In general, if a more effective activity is available, replacement is recommended.

5. This Title I activity, as currently implemented, has been assessed to be ineffective in meeting the needs of the Title I population and should be modified or removed from the Title I project in Chicago.

Additional recommendations for each Title I activity appear in the evaluation narratives of this volume.

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR
LABORATORY ACTIVITIES IN THE TEACHING OF READING

Activity:	Recommendations				
	1	2	3	4	5
Computer-Assisted Instruction			X		
Programmed Reading Instructional System			X		
Language Arts Reinforcement Center			X		
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Reading			DROPPED		
Improving Reading Achievement through the Teaching of Typewriting		X			
Hoffman's ME-dia System			X		
System 80's Program				X	
Prescription Learning			X		
High Intensity Centers			X		
Multimedia Audiovisual Readiness Kindergarten Program					X
New Century Basic Skills		X			

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR
PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES IN THE TEACHING OF READING

Activity:	Recommendations				
	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Reading Skills through Drama			X		
An Eclectic Approach to Corrective and Remedial Reading Instruction			X		
Behavioral Research Laboratories/ Sullivan Reading Program	DROPPED				
Scott, Foresman Reading System	DROPPED				
Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program			X		
Open Court Remedial Reading Program			X		
EMC Corporation/Schmerler: Phonetic/ Linguistic Reading and Language Program					X
BFA Comprehension/Vocabulary Program			X		
SRA Corrective Reading Program		X			
Support Systems for Individualized Reading				X	
Language in Transition		X			
Home Visiting Instruction Team	DROPPED				
Teaching Reading through Literature with the Newbery Award Series				X	

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR
SELF-CONTAINED ACTIVITIES

Activity:	Recommendations 1	2	3	4	5
A Kindergarten and Primary Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing			X		
An Intermediate and Upper Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing			X		
Encyclopaedia Britannica's Language Experiences in Reading			X		
Crane Reading System				X	
DISTAR Program in Reading and Language		X			
Early Intervention: A Preschool and Kindergarten Activity		X			
Early Childhood Education			DROPPED		
Instructional Team Schools				X	
Child-Parent Centers	X				
Follow Through				X	

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR
LABORATORY AND PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES
IN THE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS

Activity:	Recommendations 1	2	3	4	5
Mathematics Laboratory for the Development of Computational Skills			X		
Alternative Instructional Mathematics System			X		
Individualized Mathematics Instruction: Eclectic Approach to Remedial Mathematics Instruction			X		
Individualized Mathematics Instruction: Wynroth Math Program		X			
Pre-Algebra Development Centers				X	
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Mathematics			DROPPED		

RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR
ACTIVITIES MEETING SPECIAL NEEDS

Activity:	Recommendations 1	2	3	4	5
Career Guidance Laboratory			DROPPED		
Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading				X	
Bilingual Education Multimedia Instruction		X			
Basic Occupational and Skill Training			X		
Guidance for Title I Elementary School Pupils			X		
Family Guidance Center			X		
Field Experiences			X		
Outdoor Education and Camping			X		
Health Services			X		
School-Community Identification			X		
Parent Plus Project			X		
Institute for Parent Involvement			X		
Staff Development through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist				X	
New Educational Directions			DROPPED		
Educational Leadership Institute				X	

ACTIVITY RANKINGS AND SUMMARIES OF PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

Explanation of the tables:

The tables that follow provide summaries of the achievement and cognitive growth of pupils in each Title I activity. This information is based on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. The results reported here apply only to pupils enrolled in Title I activities in the public schools of Chicago who took the ITBS in May 1979 and in May 1980.

The ITBS is administered to pupils of age cycles seven and older. For pupils who were in preschool or of age cycles five or six other testing programs were used for the Title I evaluation. The tables in Volume 2 of this report provide results of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, which was used for pupils of age cycles five and six, and the evaluation narratives in this volume of the report give the results of the Chicago EARLY Assessment, used for preschool pupils. The reader should be cautious, therefore, in drawing conclusions as to the effectiveness of individual activities from these tables alone. Only if the instructional level designation for an activity begins with 2, designating age cycle seven or the second year of school after kindergarten, or with a higher designation, is it likely that the reported results apply to most of the pupils enrolled in the activity.

It is also true that activities which enroll many pupils of the upper cycles, particularly age cycles 13 and 14, tend to show greater average grade-equivalent gains than do activities enrolling younger pupils. Several reasons may be offered to account for this; however, the primary one is probably the extra motivation of these pupils to graduate from elementary school and of teachers to see them graduate.

The Citywide Testing Program requires that pupils be tested at their functional level. This is necessary to assure valid test results: the use of a test that is too easy or too difficult will give erroneous scores. In general, a test that is too difficult for a pupil will result in a grade-equivalent score that over-estimates the pupil's true ability and a test that is too easy under-estimate that ability.

Some teachers were under considerable pressure in fiscal 1980 to advance their pupils to higher CPML levels, sometimes before the pupils had mastered the material. Since test levels were assigned on the basis of pupil age and CPML level, such advancement sometimes caused the assignment of a test level that was too difficult for the pupil. The result of this on pupils' test scores is obvious from the foregoing. The cost associated with administering improper test levels and other departures from established testing procedures is severe, however. If a pupil's test scores are false indicators of his or her actual achievement, those scores cannot be used to diagnose areas of learning deficiencies nor can an evaluation based on such scores be expected to provide accurate and unbiased testimony about program effectiveness.

In the tables that follow a † is used to mark averages which may not be reliable.

Tables are presented for laboratory activities which provide reading instruction; pull-out activities teaching reading; self-contained activities, for which both reading and mathematics results appear; laboratory and pull-out activities providing instruction in mathematics; and for activities which serve special needs.

The tables list the activities within each type in the order determined by "Percent with standard score gain." This measure indicates the proportion of pupils who improved their percentile rank placement, on the local distribution of test scores, between pre- and posttest. It is the best indicator of whether or not Title I pupils in fiscal 1980 closed the "achievement gap" between themselves and their age peers. If at least 50 percent of the pupils in an activity increased their percentile rank placement, the activity reduced the "achievement gap" for its pupils. The evaluation objective required that at least 60 percent of the pupils achieve such gains.

All other measures used in these tables report gains in grade-equivalent years.

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RANKING AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY
FOR
LABORATORY ACTIVITIES TEACHING READING

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Reading Comprehension subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains: Highest	School gains: Lowest	Number with test results: Schools	Number with test results: Pupils
New Century Basic Skills	4-8	-	75	1.4	2.2†	0.9	3	259
Improving Reading Skills through Typing	5-8	0.9	63	0.9	1.7	0.5	24	1,763
Programmed Reading Instruction	K-8	0.7	61	0.8	1.0	0.5	11	507
Prescription Learning: Reading	1-8	0.7	60	0.8	1.5	-0.2	101	8,001
High Intensity Centers: Reading	1-8	0.7	58	0.7	1.0	0.4	13	820
Language Arts Reinforcement Center	1-8	0.7	56	0.7	1.3	0.0	18	790
Hoffman's MEdia System: Reading	1-8	0.8	54	0.7	1.0	0.4	11	527
Computer-Assisted Instruction	4-8	0.7	54	0.7	1.2	0.0	52	5,66[illegible]
System 80: Language Arts	K-8	0.5	47	0.4	1.0	0.0	13	612
MARK	K-3	0.3	33	0.2	-	-	1	12
Audio-Tutorial Reading Laboratory	3-8	-	47	0.7	-	-	1	34

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RANKING AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY
FOR
PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES TEACHING READING

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Reading Comprehension subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains: Highest	School gains: Lowest	Number with test results: Schools	Number with test results: Pupils
Scott, Foresman Reading System	1-6	0.8	69	0.8	-	-	1	95
Language in Transition	K-8	-	64	0.7	1.4	0.3	10	121
SRA Corrective Reading Program	4-8	-	62	0.9	1.1	0.6	6	273
Teaching Literature with the Newbery Series	7-8	-	58	0.8	1.0	0.7	6	365
Eclectic Approach to Reading	1-8	0.7	58	0.7	1.8	0.2	89	4,618
BFA Comprehension/ Vocabulary Program	1-8	-	58	0.7	0.8	0.5	3	66
BRL/Sullivan Reading Program	1-8	0.7	56	0.8	1.0	0.7	2	50
Teaching Reading through Drama	4-8	0.8	55	0.8	1.0	0.4	11	609
Open Court Remedial Reading Program	4-8	0.7	55	0.7	1.0	0.2	6	307
EMC/Schmerler Reading and Language Program	1-8	0.8	53	0.6	-	-	1	30
Support Systems for Individualized Reading	1-8	0.7	45	0.6	0.7	0.5	4	185
Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program	K-5	0.6	45	0.6	0.9	0.4	4	52

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RANKING AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY
FOR
SELF-CONTAINED ACTIVITIES

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Reading Comprehension subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains: Highest	School gains: Lowest	Number with test results: Schools	Number with test results: Pupils
DISTAR	K-3	0.8	62	0.8	1.1	0.4	7	205
Augmented Staffing for Int. & Upper Levels	4-8	0.8	61	0.8	1.9†	0.1	70	2,996
Encyclopaedia Britannica	K-3	0.7	60	0.9	1.4	0.1	5	154
Augmented Staffing for Kin. & Prim. Levels	K-3	0.7	59	0.8	2.2†	0.0	47	1,137
Instructional Team Schools	1-8	0.7	56	0.8	1.3	0.2	13	1,488
Crane Reading System	K-3	0.7	50	0.6	1.5	0.0	11	358
Follow Through	K-3	0.7	42	0.5	1.2	0.1	6	273

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Mathematics Total subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains: Highest	School gains: Lowest	Number with test results: Schools	Number with test results: Pupils
Encyclopaedia Britannica	K-3	-	72	1.0	1.1	0.5	5	147
DISTAR	K-3	-	68	0.9	1.3	0.5	7	204
Augmented Staffing for Kin. & Prim Levels	K-3	0.8	61	0.8	1.8	-0.5	48	1,183
Instructional Team Schools	1-8	-	59	0.8	1.1	0.2	13	1,457
Crane Reading System	K-8	-	56	0.6	0.9	0.4	11	361
Augmented Staffing for Int. & Upper Levels	4-8	0.7	53	0.7	1.9†	0.0	70	2,976
Follow Through	K-3	0.7	52	0.7	1.2	0.1	6	269

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RANKING AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY
FOR
LABORATORY ACTIVITIES TEACHING MATHEMATICS

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Mathematics Total subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains: Highest	School gains: Lowest	Number with test results: Schools	Number with test results: Pupils
Audio-Tutorial Mathematics Laboratory	3-8	0.9	75	1.0	-	-	1	60
High Intensity Centers	1-8	1.0	74	1.1	-	-	1	65
Alternative Instruction Mathematics System	K-8	-	62	1.0	1.2	0.8	6	434
System 80: Mathematics	K-8	0.9	61	0.8	1.1	0.6	7	186
Prescription Learning: Mathematics	1-8	0.9	58	0.9	1.3	0.1	28	2,016
Math Lab for Computational Skills	3-8	0.9	58	0.9	1.1	0.5	18	1,111
Computer-Assisted Instruction	4-8	0.8	52	0.7	1.2	0.2	43	3,904
FOR PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES TEACHING MATHEMATICS								
Ind. Math Instruction: Wynroth	1-8	-	83	1.0	1.0	0.8	2	47
Ind. Math Instruction: Eclectic	4-8	-	63	0.9	1.3	0.7	17	636
Pre-Algebra Development Centers	7-8	-	54	0.9	1.3	0.6	3	219

INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RANKING AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY
FOR
ACTIVITIES SERVING SPECIAL NEEDS

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Reading Comprehension subtest

Activity	Instructional level	Three-year mean gain	Percent with standard score gain	Average grade-equivalent gain	School gains:		Number with test results:	
					Highest	Lowest	Schools	Pupils
New Educational Directions	2-8	-	92	1.3	-	-	1	13
Basic Occupational and Skill Training (BOAST)	8-9	0.7	66	0.8	1.3	0.5	6	361
Bilingual Education Multimedia Instruction	K-4	-	64	0.7	-	-	1	22
Career Guidance Laboratory	1-8	0.8	62	1.0	1.2	0.8	3	180
Instructional Labs: Art	1-8	-	60	0.8	1.8†	-0.4	30	1,254
Staff Development through a Reading Specialist	2-8	0.7	57	0.8	2.4	-0.1	21	285
Educational Leadership Institute	2-8	0.8	57	0.8	2.2†	0.1	23	731
Instructional Labs: Science	1-8	-	57	0.7	1.6	-0.2	40	2,381
Instructional Labs: Creative Arts	1-8	-	57	0.7	1.0	0.5	8	430

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills: Mathematics Total subtest

Career Guidance Laboratory	1-8	0.8	62	1.0	1.3	0.7	3	179
Basic Occupational and Skill Training (BOAST)	8-9	-	62	0.7	1.1	0.3	6	346
Educational Leadership Institute	2-8	-	55	0.8	1.8†	0.2	24	726

EVALUATION NARRATIVES

R&E #6, 7, 8
Project #563
Program #7619
Evaluator: Earl Clendenon

COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Each Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) room is equipped with 15 computer terminals and a printer. These are connected by telephone lines to a computer in the central office. The activity in each school is managed by a teacher aide. Four Department of Curriculum coordinators in the central office manage the operation of the program, including training of the aides and of the teachers whose pupils participate in the activity.

The activity provides daily computerized prescriptive practice on reading skills and on either mathematics or language skills for a minimum of 150 pupils per unit in the fourth through the eighth years beyond kindergarten.

The computer program does not supply instruction. Teachers of the participating pupils, assisted by the aide, must impart understanding of operational procedures at the terminal and, above all, of the concepts and skills for which the computer program supplies practice. The computer frees the teachers from the task of providing such practice in the classroom and from monitoring the pupils' performance. The teachers and aides are trained for their respective roles at inservice meetings.

Skill-practice exercises of graduated difficulty appear on the terminal screen from strands of items stored in the computer. The pupil's responses transmitted on the terminal keyboard determine the pupil's movement through the strands.

A Computer-Assisted Instruction group may be composed of 15 pupils who come to the activity room from several classrooms for 20-minute sessions at the terminals, or it may be composed of one entire classroom of Title I pupils who come to the computer room, with their teacher, for a 40-minute period. In the latter case, while 15 pupils work at the terminals, those awaiting their turns at the terminals work on assignments provided by and supervised by the teacher. The scheduling plan is selected by the schools.

After each group session, the computer prints back a detailed analysis of each pupil's performance together with an update of his or her activity achievement record. The printout is passed on to the classroom teacher for use in planning instruction for individual pupils or for the group, if common needs are evident.

In fiscal 1980 Computer-Assisted Instruction units were operating in 52 public and two nonpublic schools. The activity served approximately 9,190 pupils.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Activity Selection and Implementation

In fiscal 1980 interviews, principals consistently mentioned that CAI was selected for their schools because it provided individually prescribed skill practice, served a relatively larger number of pupils than comparable Title I activities, and allowed the scheduling of the activity to be adapted to various combinations of time slots in the total school program. Several principals also cited evaluation reports and school staff considerations of the effectiveness of CAI in previous years.

Retention of this activity once it has been installed in a school is reasonable, barring dissatisfaction with the program. CAI requires relatively elaborate physical changes in the room provided for it: telephone cable wiring, air-conditioners, carrels, and an exceptionally secure door. The aide who manages the program is very specially trained; six principals alluded to this investment of experience in their comments.

Forty-one principals reported that CAI classes for all participants started before the October 15, 1979, deadline for full implementation of Title I activities. Two principals reported later starting dates, caused by late assignment of the aide in one case and, in the other, by a delay in selecting the participants.

Space, Equipment, and Materials

An ample and secure space is a prerequisite for installing a CAI room. Observations by field evaluators during the fall of 1979 indicated that these facilitites were invariably standard size or larger than standard size classrooms. Even so, at a few sites when a class of 30 or more pupils was present (15 working at the terminals while the others worked at tables or desks), observers reported that the room was crowded. Since CAI rooms are airconditioned, such crowding becomes a problem only when the pupils who are not at the terminals are inadequately supervised by their teacher.

Univac cathode-ray terminals comprise the main equipment in this activity. These machines sites have been in use for seven years or longer at many sites. The frequency of out-of-order terminals (as many as three out of 15 terminals at the same time) and comments by a few principals and teachers suggested that the age of this equipment had become a deterrent to satisfactory maintenance. However, observers rated the activity implementation "adequate" at all of the 31 sites visited during the fall.

Apart from paper used in the printer, materials provided for the CAI activity consist of learning games, booklets on topics of interest to school children, and similar things selected to occupy the pupils for up to 20 minutes when the terminals are not working. These materials are intended for the participants' regular classroom teachers, to be used at their discretion when CAI classes are cancelled. In some schools these materials are stored in the CAI room and may be used by pupils under the supervision of the aide. The choice of procedure depends upon the principal's view of the school's circumstances and needs.

Staffing

Twenty-one percent of the aides who returned questionnaires had worked in the CAI activity for five years or longer and 51 percent had one to three years of CAI experience. Five aides had been assigned to their positions for six months or less, which probably reflected the mid-year staff changes caused by severe cuts in Board of Education personnel.

On an evaluation checklist, a large majority of the principals indicated that the service of the CAI staff was very effective. Six principals stated that the service was adequate; there were no indications of inadequate service.

The scheduling of CAI classes was often closely linked with gym, library, and teacher-break schedules. Since substitutes were not provided for Title I aides, the absence of a CAI aide caused difficulties which some principals overcame by training another Title I aide (or teachers whose pupils are CAI participants) to operate the activity. Thus, at some sites cancellations of CAI classes because of an aide's absence were circumvented.

Inservice

All but one of the CAI aides who responded felt that their training in managing the activity was adequate or better than adequate. The observation of one inservice meeting for teachers whose pupils attended CAI indicated that a high standard of efficiency in conducting the training was maintained. The inservice presentations were centered upon thoroughly acquainting the new participating teachers with the operation of the terminals, with the content of the computerized program, and with the uses of the printouts of the pupil progress records.

Training for new participating teachers who were assigned after the usual round of fall inservice meetings was provided through the year as needed. Comments from two participating teachers indicated that the training received was inadequate for their needs.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Role of the Aide

The aide's role in Computer-Assisted Instruction is to manage the activity room, operate the printer, bring the terminals on line, and supervise the pupils working at the terminals. That most of the aides performed these tasks competently and conscientiously was well documented in the observers' comments on visits to 31 CAI sites in the fall of 1979:

> pupils were attentive and absorbed in their tasks,
>
> classrooms were spacious and well decorated,
>
> pupils arrived and awaited turns at the terminals in an orderly manner by reading or doing other school work,
>
> very attractive CAI laboratories were the rule: beautiful bulletin boards with schedules and procedural rules posted,
>
> this CAI group needed little assistance; everyone knew what to do and did it.

On the other hand, some aides appeared not to be as conscientious or as competent as the responsibilities of their positions required. One was observed reading a newspaper and listening to a radio while pupils were present. A few seemed to be in need of training to improve their attitudes toward the pupils; they were needlessly gruff or seemingly disinterested when the pupils arrived. Also, at a few sites the displays and decorations were faded from years of exposure to light without being changed or renewed. This suggests a need for reviving the enthusiasm of a few aides who have worked in this activity for many years.

Instructional Procedures and Problems

The work that CAI pupils do at the terminals is computer-controlled individualized practice on skills (ten minutes of work on reading followed by ten minutes of work on mathematics or language-structure). The instruction required to practice these skills efficiently at the terminals is the responsibility of the pupil's regular classroom teacher. While the pupil is working at the terminal only assistance in operating the controls correctly can be given; assistance in answering the questions or working the problems would invalidate the computerized record of the pupil's progress. After the pupils have been carefully trained, the procedures for using the terminals present no problems. Frustrations and disappointments occur only when, occasionally, the terminals stop operating or when the pupil lacks understanding of the concepts underlying the practice.

Observations of the pupils' activities and behavior in CAI rooms during the fall of 1979 and spring of 1980 confirmed expectations. The pupils were on task in more than 90 percent of the observations. Restless, apathetic, or talkative behavior comprised four percent of the fall observations and seven percent of the spring observations. These percentages of off-task behavior were somewhat higher than in four comparable Title I laboratory activities. The source was predominantly the behavior of pupils who were waiting for their turns at the terminals. Pupils working at the terminals were usually absorbed in their tasks.

It may be emphasized here that when an entire class of 30 or more pupils is present in the CAI room, it is essential for the supervising teacher to provide the waiting pupils with meaningful work to do. Sometimes when such classes are under the supervision of a substitute teacher, the disorderliness of the waiting pupils is a serious distraction to those at the terminals.

When CAI classes are cancelled or halted because the terminals are temporarily not working, the pupils may be directed to return to their regular classrooms or may stay out their session in the CAI room under the aide's supervision. This is the main occasion for which the supplementary materials are provided. During a few observations these materials were in use.

Table 1 shows the number of aides who reported half-day or full-day CAI class cancellations in fiscal 1980. Although each pupil's progress in CAI is strictly controlled by time spent working on the terminals, the data in Table 1 suggest that the frequency of CAI class cancellations should be reduced.

TABLE 1. FREQUENCY AND REASONS FOR CAI CANCELLATIONS

	Number of Cancellations Reported		
Reason for cancellation	1 or 2	3 to 5	6 or more
Terminals not working	12	11	8
Duties outside CAI room	6	6	-
Special testing	12	9	1
Special school events	7	7	3
Other reasons	1	5	3

Nineteen teachers whose pupils participated in CAI returned questionnaires. A majority mentioned that the pupils' achievement in reading or mathematics was aided by participation in this activity. However, several teachers offered the following criticisms:

> lack of specific correlation of CAI program skills with Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning curriculum skills,
>
> extreme differences between grade-equivalent scores attained in the CAI program and those attained on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills,
>
> lack of continuity for the pupils because of frequent terminal breakdowns and aide absences.

Pupil Response

It was mentioned in another context that the pupils worked attentively at the CAI terminals. Their attitude toward their tasks was not infrequently noted to be eager or enthusiastic. Intermediate pupils especially tended to rush to the terminals as fast as respect for behavior rules permitted, even punching the keys to bring on their individualized programs while pulling out their chairs to sit down. But a bored or lackadaisical attitude was sometimes reported or observed when pupils had been CAI participants for more than two consecutive years.

The CAI aides play an important role, often beyond the call of their prescribed duties, in stimulating the pupils' interest in the program through appropriate competitive games and awards. Besides giving verbal encouragement and praise for steady effort and steady progress, most of the aides used one or more of the following motivational devices:

stars posted on progress charts,

honor-roll displays for "topping out",

rewards for perfect scores ranging from cookies or pencils to model airplaines, parties, or Christmas gifts,

extra-time on the terminals during the aide's lunch period.

One aide awarded five dollars to every eighth-year pupil who successfully completed the entire CAI program. (It may be inserted here that the materials for some of the displays and for the awards were usually bought by the aides with their own money.)

The pupils' responses to these motivations was often apparent in their proud inspection of new postings of their records and in their glad reports of new accomplishments to the aides or teachers.

Staff Communication

Staff communication in the CAI activity consisted mainly of exchanges of information between the aide and the teachers whose pupils were the participants. Specific data regarding each pupil's status in each skill strand of the computerized program were furnished in a daily printout sent to each teacher. In addition a monthly summary of class progress was obtained from the printer. It was the teacher's responsibility, as emphasized in the training sessions, to use these documents in planning individualized or group classroom instruction.

All the aides reported that most of the CAI sending teachers cooperated in the following ways:

sent pupils to the CAI room on time,

supervised the pupils regularly in the CAI room when expected to do so, talked with the aide occasionally about their pupils' progress or behavior in the CAI room,

accepted the aide's role in managing the activity.

Parent Involvement

Seventy parents returned questionnaires distributed to them through a random sample of CAI activity pupils. Forty-percent indicated that they had visited the CAI room at least once during the school year. A few claimed to have visited the activity room on many occasions (as often as 10 times in one case). Ninety percent of the parents indicated that they had visited their children's regular classroom teachers at least once and generally two to five times.

The parents' rating of the CAI program ranged from poor (one response) to excellent (26 percent of the responses). Fifty-five percent of the parents felt that the program was a good one, and all but one parent felt that it should be continued.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

The data discussed in this section appear in full in Volume 2 of this report.

Average grade-equivalent gain scores in reading comprehension for CAI pupils in fiscal 1980 were six months for eight- to eleven-year-old pupils and eight months for twelve- to fourteen-year-old pupils. The average gain across all ages was seven months, one month less than the average gain for all Title I pupils. However, the average gain score of the upper level CAI pupils was two months less than that of all upper level Title I pupils.

Fifty-nine percent of the upper level CAI pupils attained a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension. This was the only CAI group that came close to meeting the 60 percent criterion of that objective.

The average grade-equivalent gain scores on the vocabulary subtest for pupils in this activity were generally one month below those in reading comprehension. The percentage of pupils who attained positive standard score gains in this case failed to exceed the 60 percent criterion of the objective.

Mathematics grade-equivalent gain scores for CAI pupils paralleled those of other Title I pupils. More than 60 percent of the pupils in age cycles 13 and 14 attained standard score gains in mathematics; the objective was met in this case.

In a ranking of ten Title I laboratory activities on the percentage of pupils who attained positive standard score gains in reading comprehension, CAI was eighth. Over the period from fiscal 1977 through fiscal 1980, CAI ranged from fifth to seventh in rank among eight comparable activities.

Several variables influence these rankings. Among these, undoubtedly, are school, teacher, and pupil-selection effects in addition to errors of measurement. These rankings should be interpreted as indicative, not definitive.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Since no teachers were supported with Title I funds in CAI and since the program can serve 150 pupils, this activity continued to be the least expensive in cost per pupil ($163) among four comparable Title I learning-laboratory programs. Generally, principals and their program selection committees perceived these advantages to be cost effective.

CONSLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Salient points of the foregoing discussion may be summarized as follows:

> The CAI activity was efficiently implemented in fiscal 1980 but evidently the age of the equipment at several sites caused an annoying number of terminal breakdowns.
>
> Typically the aides evidenced a high standard of competence in managing the CAI rooms and a conscientious effort to stimulate the pupils' interest and pride in making good progress through the program's skill-practice strands.
>
> The pupils generally were observed to pursue their tasks at the terminals eagerly and attentively.
>
> Reading comprehension achievement gain scores generally were lower than corresponding scores for all Title I pupils but average mathematics gain scores across each age group matched those for all Title I pupils.

The following recommendations are submitted for the consideration of the program administrators:

Consider ways to reduce the frequency of equipment breakdowns and, if possible, increase the number of persons who are available to make repairs.

Advise the principals not to retain a pupil in this activity for more than two years without first inquiring about the pupil's interest in continuing.

Provide an annual special-occasion meeting for the CAI aides to commend and inspire their involvement in the pupils' needs for personal attention and encouragement.

Seek out funding to accelerate the creation of new computerized instruction lessons correlated with specific Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning curriculum skills.

Retain Computer-Assisted Instruction among the activities offered in Chicago's Title I project until it is determined that no funds are available for replacing the deteriorated equipment and for rejuvenating the content of the program.

R&E #19
Project #587
Program #7623
Evaluator: Earl Clendenon

PROGRAMMED READING INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Programmed Reading Instructional System (PRIS) activity may serve pupils from kindergarten through the eighth year beyond kindergarten. The basic materials are programmed workbooks published by the Webster/McGraw-Hill Company. These are supplemented with the Educational Development Laboratory Reading Skills Support System, a collection of manipulatives, booklets, and materials for use in projection and listening devices. Instruction aides such as display cards, learning kits, high-interest storybooks, criterion-referenced tests, and self-correcting keys used by the pupils are an integral part of the program.

The teacher, with the assistance of an aide, guides the pupils individually in using the instruction materials and provides small-group instruction or practice to establish understanding of fundamental concepts and skills. Several pupils, using headsets plugged into a multiple jack, may work together on the main audio-visual device that presents sequenced instruction on skills together with directions for completing paper-and-pencil practice exercises.

In fiscal 1980 there were approximately 1,050 pupils in PRIS at 12 public and one non-public schools.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Activity Selection and Implementation

Eight principals of the 13 whose schools had PRIS in fiscal 1980 mentioned, in interviews, that they considered it effective in previous years and felt it met the needs of the pupils whom it was selected to serve. The perception of activity effectiveness was not concentrated upon any particular age group. In at least three of the schools this activity served exclusively pupils above the fourth year beyond kindergarten; in other schools the activity predominantly served primary pupils. The range of pupils served was apparently related to the general need for a program providing individually prescribed instruction in a small-group setting.

Three principals mentioned also that the activity was continued because the teacher and aide had become a talented, highly experienced team in managing the program. At one school where the activity was in its first year of operation, observations of the program operating in other schools and evaluation reports had satisfied school staff members and community representatives in making their selection. On the other hand, the principal of one of four schools that dropped this activity in fiscal 1980 mentioned dissatisfaction with the program because of the low reading achievement gain scores of the participating pupils.

All the principals who were interviewed reported that instruction in PRIS had started by October 15, 1979, the deadline for full implementation of Title I activities.

Space, Materials, and Equipment

Observations conducted in the fall of 1979 indicated that none of the eight PRIS classrooms visited shared space with another class, and only one site was smaller than a standard classroom. The materials and equipment in view and the quantities seen at all these sites conformed to those prescribed for this activity. Two principals reported that some of the instruction materials ordered were not delivered as promised, and two teachers reported that the service from the program vendor's consultant was unsatisfactory.

In the spring of 1980 observers visited 11 PRIS laboratories. Their ratings of the teachers' success in implementing the activity (their management of the program and use of the facility) averaged 2.82 on a five-point scale. This was somewhat lower than the average (3.30) for four other comparable learning laboratory activities. Three PRIS sites were rated below "sound implementation," the midpoint of the scale; two sites were rated four, "better than sound implementation."

Staff

Twelve of 13 schools were continuing the PRIS activity in fiscal 1980, and generally the teachers and aides had been retained from year to year. Only one teacher and two aides had been assigned to the activity for less than two years. No staffing problems were reported in the interviews with principals or indicated in the teachers' questionnaire responses.

Inservice

The teachers' and aides' reports of their attendance at inservice meetings for PRIS staff indicated that the training provisions of the activity proposal were fulfilled. With respect to content, the teachers rated the meetings they had attended "good" or "very good." The aides' ratings, "good" except in one case, may reflect what has been often observed at Title I inservice meetings which the aides share with the teachers: some of the aides show only a perfunctory interest because the agenda usually is planned for the teachers' benefit. It may be added here that some aides, from time to time, have expressed a desire for at least one training session apart from the teachers. The evaluator's observations of inservice training for staff of PRIS and other laboratory activities suggest that giving deliberate prominence occasionally to the aides' role would generally upgrade the quality of the meetings.

Seventy-eight percent of the PRIS teachers who returned questionnaires indicated that attending the activity inservice meetings had contributed to improvement in their classroom instruction. Thus the objective that 75 percent of the teachers would report such improvements was attained.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Role of the Aide

During the fall and spring observations in eight PRIS laboratories it was found that the aides' activities consisted predominantly of:

- supervising the learning tasks or routine changes of tasks of small groups of pupils,
- taking care of clerical work or preparing materials for lessons.

These observations agreed with the aides' reports of the distribution of their duties. Most of the nine aides who returned questionnaires indicated that tasks belonging to the categories just mentioned were included in their duties every day. In addition all the aides indicated that they frequently assisted individual pupils with learning tasks (tutorial instruction) and minor behavior problems or personal needs. They estimated that more than 50 percent of their time was devoted to direct relationships with the pupils.

Their indications of rapport with their supervising teachers were unanimously positive:

- the teachers' directions regarding the aides' duties were clear,
- the teachers exhibited confidence in the aides' skills,
- the aides were satisfied with the amount of responsibility granted to them,
- the aides were comfortable enough with their teachers to discuss problems with them or to make suggestions regarding the operation of the activity.

As indicated in questionnaire responses, the teachers' perceptions of the aides' duties and contributions to the instructional program were without exception consistent with the aides' perceptions.

Teacher Effects

In the spring of 1980, observers' ratings of four classroom climate characteristics in 11 PRIS laboratories resulted in the following averages based on a five-point scale:

> Instruction clear, well organized, and relevant to activity objectives (3.91)
>
> Physical appearancce of the classroom conducive to learning and generating pride (3.91)
>
> Classroom routines conducive to self-control, minimal loss of time on task, and minimal disturbance (3.45)
>
> Teacher's management of pupils' behavior firm, fair, friendly, and alert to pupils' needs for attention (3.45)

These averages were lower than the corresponding averages for four comparable laboratory programs. The differences reflected relatively more frequent observations of a lower degree of "classroom routines conducive to self-control" in PRIS classrooms. Ratings on the first two factors listed above were closer to those reported for comparable Title I activities.

Instructional Procedures and Problems

The basal material of the PRIS activity was a workbook in which the pupil, after writing in a response to each sequenced learning step, gets immediate feedback on his or her success by sliding down a cardboard shield that then reveals the correct answer and directions for moving on. Observations indicated that primary pupils, particularly the youngest and slowest learners, evidenced a serious lack of comprehension of the connection between the stepwise exercises and the concepts they were expected to absorb. In two cases it was observed that the teachers were aware of the pupils' difficulties and compensated for them by slowly directing small groups of pupils through the lesson, requiring the pupils first to respond orally and then discussing their errors before the answers were marked in the workbooks.

This procedure, though necessary when the pupils are being introduced to the materials, loses the intended advantage of the programmed workbooks. They were intended to assure that pupils would be able to proceed through the lessons independently at their individual rates of progress. On the other hand, intermediate pupils were observed using the workbooks with ease and concentrating on group instruction through the COMBO audiovisual machine without close supervision from the teacher or aide.

In summary, the basal materials appeared to lack content that firmly engaged the interest and understanding of slow-learning primary pupils. On the whole, in fiscal 1980, the activity was efficiently managed.

Staff Communication

One non-Title I teacher whose pupils were participants in PRIS added this comment to the questionnaire: "Students are not transferring what they learned in the the Title I program to their regular classwork. To me, the Programmed Reading lab is not very effective." This teacher also reported that she and the PRIS teacher did not share information regarding the participants' progress in learning, while the teachers who did report such sharing of information indicated that this activity was well correlated with the schools' curriculum. The same discrepancy in responses was apparent in other data regarding communication between the activity teachers and the sending teachers. Three of the latter reported that the Title I teachers had presented an orientation to the activity for non-Title Title I staff and that their pupils had learned more by attending PRIS than if they had not attended.

Needless to say, the responses of only four sending teachers do not represent well the opinions of perhaps 50 or more teachers whose pupils were participants. However, eight of the nine activity teachers who returned questionnaires reported having weekly or monthly communication with the sending teachers, usually through informal conversation but also through planned conferences or written reports.

Evidently the goal of better communication between the Title I teachers and the regular classroom teachers was supported by the PRIS staff in fiscal 1980.

Pupil Response

The pupils' response to PRIS was discussed to some extent in the preceding section, in relation to their use of the equipment and materials. Here it may be said that observations of the pupils' behavior (while they were involved predominantly in independent work on individualized tasks or in group work on the audiovisual machine) were classified as "on task" in 95 percent of the cases. During twenty-minute visits to 11 PRIS sites, in the spring of 1980, only two instances of apathetic or restless behavior were recorded. Nine activity teachers estimated that the participation of about 90 percent of their pupils could be described as "actively interested."

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Most PRIS teachers who returned questionnaires characterized the parents' participation as "interested but not active." However, the participation of about one-fourth of the parents was characterized as "actively interested." Support for these estimates was reflected in the teachers' reports of the number of parents who had visited them, voluntarily or upon request, to discuss their child's progress. On average 24 parents visited each teacher.

A majority of the 17 parents who returned questionnaires indicated that they had visited the activity room at least once during fiscal 1980. Their ratings of the effectiveness of this program ranged from poor to excellent. Most frequently the ratings were good or fair. All but one of these parents felt that the activity should be continued.

The data discussed above, particularly the variation of the parents' opinion of the activity, suggested an exceptional awareness of the program among the parents and an exceptional degree of active participation.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

In fiscal 1980, gain scores in reading comprehension for PRIS averaged seven grade-equivalent months for primary pupils and eight months for intermediate and upper level pupils. The average gain for upper level pupils in all Title I activities was 10 months, for intermediate pupils six months, and primary pupils seven months.

Sixty-one percent of the 507 pupils for whom matched pre-and posttest scores were available attained standard score gains. Hence, the objective that 60 percent of such pupils would do so was met.

On the vocabulary subtest, PRIS pupils averaged seven months of gain and only 57 percent attained a positive standard score gain.

The preceding data derive from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. Sixty-four six-year-old pupils in this activity were given the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Only 20 percent of these pupils exceeded the fiftieth percentile in reading for pupils in the first year beyond kindergarten nationally. The 40 percent criterion set in the evaluation objective was not met.

Complete tabulations of the achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In comparison with four similar laboratory programs, the cost per pupil of PRIS ($576) ranked second lowest in fiscal 1980. Considering that the reading achievement gains of the participants were satisfactory for programs of this type, it may be said that this activity was cost effective.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To bring together salient points of the foregoing discussion, in fiscal 1980 the Programmed Reading Instructional System activity:

was well implemented except for some inconvenience to a few teachers who did not receive adequate service from the program vendor's consultant;

showed some need for careful local-school staff evaluations of the effectiveness of the activity materials at primary levels;

produced comparatively good reading achievement gains and was reasonably cost effective.

The following recommendations are submitted for the consideration of the program administrators:

require the program vendor to combine the provision of inservice meetings and the provision of on-site consultant services under the supervision of just one of the two publishing companies which supply the activity materials;

provide more specific training for the activity aides;

caution local-school staff, when selecting this activity, to give careful attention to the content of the programmed materials;

retain PRIS among the activities offered in Chicago's Title I project.

R&E #31
Project #608
Program #7631
Evaluator: Marion Rice

LANGUAGE ARTS REINFORCEMENT CENTER

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Language Arts Reinforcement Centers (LARC) enrolled 1,350 first through eighth year pupils in 19 schools in fiscal 1980, its fifth year in the Chicago Title I project. The LARC approach, developed by Psychotechnics, Inc., focused pupil attention on basic perceptual and reading skills through exercises using special auditory and visual teaching equipment. The learning kits and supplementary books provided extensive practice in reading words and phrases and building language arts skills.

Pupils were to meet in regular-sized classrooms and receive 30 or 40 minutes of instruction, depending on age. A teacher and an aide were assigned to each laboratory and directed the learning activities of 50 or 75 children. All but three schools chose the 75-pupil option.

New teachers were offered three days of preservice training in the LARC method, and all teachers were scheduled to attend other sessions held at frequent intervals. Consultant service was available throughout the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The three main reasons for selecting the activity were: its effectiveness at the school in previous years, its ability to best fit the needs of the pupils, and evaluation reports which indicated it was a successful activity.

Initiation of Instruction

Except where new teachers were assigned and where school reorganization delayed class scheduling, no long delays were reported in the initiation of instruction. Correlation of Title I activity materials with Chicago CP/ML levels was moderately easy.

Staff

Late assignment of the teacher and aide was reported in one instance. In two instances, the assistant principal was also the LARC teacher. No principals indicated shortage of teachers as being a problem and only one principal indicated shortage of aides as being a problem. LARC principals rated staff above average in effectiveness; the rating was slightly higher than the average for all Title I activities.

For 18 LARC teachers who responded to a questionnaire, the average amount of teacher experience in the activity was 2.5 years. Eighty-nine percent of the teachers said they would like to teach LARC again; this was slightly lower than the 94 percent observed in the average reading laboratory activity. For those who were receiving SCR or home visitor service, 62 percent felt that the service had made them more aware of the Title I pupils' home situations. All teachers had a teacher aide assigned to their rooms for the majority of the school year.

Of the 15 teacher aides who responded to a questionnaire, 77 percent were in their first year with the activity. All of the aides felt that the teachers' directions regarding their duties were very clear or clear, 93 percent felt that the teachers had confidence in their skills, 67 percent spent more than 50 percent of their time working directly with pupils, and 93 percent felt comfortable enough with their Title I teachers to discuss problems or initiate new ideas. These percentages were not unlike those for other activities.

Inservice

There were three full days of initial training for new teachers and three half-days during the year for continuing teachers. On-site consultant service was provided as needed for effective implementation. The above average rating given the activity inservice by the LARC principals was consistent with the overall Title I rating for inservice. The number and type of inservices resembled those of other activities.

Results of the teacher questionnaire reveal that inservice provided by district staff received the highest ratings, i.e., 50 percent good and 50 percent very good. Vendor inservice received the lowest rating with four percent of the teachers indicating that it was poor and seven percent indicating that it was fair. On-site consultations received a high rating with 82 percent of the teachers indicating that it was very good. Ninety-four percent of the teachers felt that the inservice had improved their classroom instruction; this was somewhat higher than the 90 percent for other laboratory activities. Title I teacher aides considered the inservices provided by supervising teachers to be exceptionally good.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

All observed laboratories were operating in full-sized classrooms. No problems were reported with materials, equipment, or supplies. Materials, equipment, and vendor service were rated above average by activity principals.

Most of the teachers (94 percent) felt that the instructional materials for the activity were provided in adequate quantity for all levels. Eighty-nine percent rated the quality of the instructional materials as excellent or good; this percentage was slightly less than the 93 percent rating for other reading laboratory activities. All of the consumable supplies were received in adequate quantity which compared favorably with the 89 percent in similar activities. Eighty-two percent of the teachers were able to individualize instruction with the materials. Sixty-four percent were involved in the selection of materials. The above results are as would be expected for this type of activity.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations revealed that the average number of pupils enrolled was 14 and the average number in attendance was 12. Ninety-nine percent of the pupils were found to be on task. The percentage of direct instructional interaction time with pupils resembled that of other reading laboratory activities.

Teacher aides spent the largest proportion of their time engaged in the following activities: assisting pupils individually with learning tasks, reinforcing learning by conducting group instruction or group practice, and supervising Title I pupils outside the classroom. Title I classes had been cancelled an average of 10 days per teacher during the school year which was consistent with other reading laboratories. For those teachers who were familiar with other Title I activities, 93 percent felt that this activity was comparatively very effective; this was higher than the 85 percent of other activities.

Pupil Response

LARC teachers reported that the majority of students were actively and cooperatively interested. Non-Title I classroom teachers observed great improvement in the academic effort of their pupils participating in LARC.

Communication

All of the activity teachers reported that they communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' progress. This compared favorably with the 96 percent found in other activities. Most of the teachers communicated informally on a weekly basis.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Eighty-one percent of the 21 parents who returned a questionnaire were aware that their children were participating in Title I program; this fell short of the 90 percent objective but approached that of similar activities. Eighty-six percent of the parents had visited their children's regular classrooms and 57 percent had visited the Title I classrooms. For those who had visited the Title I classroom, the average number of visits was eight. Ninety percent of the parents had been working more with their children on school related activities during fiscal 1980 than they had the previous year; this percentage was higher than the 81 percent observed in the average laboratory activity. The parent ratings of the program were slightly lower than those of other activities.

Sixty-seven percent of the parents felt that their children had achieved more than they would have without the extra program and 90 percent would like to see the program continued.

LARC teachers reported that the majority of the parents were either actively and cooperatively interested or interested but not active but many were not noticeably interested.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 demonstrates that none of the achievement objectives were met. LARC was about average for laboratory reading activities in terms of Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) gains. Its three-year average gain was also not unlike that of other laboratory activities. When compared to Title I overall, LARC was slightly lower in both standard score gains and grade-equivalent gains in reading, i.e., 56 percent and seven months versus 58 percent and eight months. For the 18 LARC schools with ITBS results, the mean grade-equivalent gains ranged from zero to 13 months and the percent of pupils having positive standard score gains ranged from zero to 96 percent.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=790)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	56	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No

Of the 67 six-year-old pupils who took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, 37 percent exceeded the national average.

A complete tabulation of achievement data appears in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

LARC's estimated total cost was $809,201 for 1,350 pupils. The cost per pupil was $599 and the cost per pupil hour of instruction was $5.58. The cost per pupil hour of instruction was consistent with the average cost for laboratory reading activities.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

Program selection was based on the administrators' perceived needs of pupils.

Instruction was begun promptly.

Teacher experience in the activity averaged over two years while most of the aides were in their the first year.

Inservices by district staff and supervising teachers were considered exceptionally good. Teachers felt that inservice training had improved classroom instruction.

No problems were reported with respect to materials and equipment.

Teachers rated the activity as comparatively effective with respect to other Title I activities.

Staff had little difficulty in correlating materials with CP/ML Levels.

Teachers were able to individualize instruction with the materials.

Pupils were found to be on task and cooperatively and actively interested. Non-Title I teachers noted improvement in academic effort.

Communication was excellent; teachers tended to communicate informally on a weekly basis with respect to pupil progress.

Parental awareness of the activity was not as great as was desired.

LARC was most successful for upper age level students, but overall was slightly below the Title I average with respect to standard score gain and grade-equivalent gains in reading; it was about average for laboratory activities.

Cost per pupil hour of instruction was average for reading laboratory activities.

LARC has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils and is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing the desired effects.

Summary

The activity's results were typical for reading laboratory activities; LARC seems to have had adequate materials, staff, and inservice. Achievement gains were average for reading laboratories but below average for all Title I activities.

R&E #35
Project #603
Program #7635
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

AUDIO-TUTORIAL LABORATORY FOR INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS: READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress (AT-R) activity had been a part of the Chicago Title I project for seven years in fiscal 1980. AT-R was purchased by one school and served 30 pupils in the fourth to sixth years of school beyond kindergarten. The activity was in its second year of operation at the school.

One teacher would provide instruction to at least five classes daily with approximately six pupils per class. Each class was to last forty minutes and to meet in a classroom especially equipped for AT-R.

Educational Development Corporation provided consultant services and maintained the laboratory which contained cassette players, headsets, sound filmstrip projectors, and audio flashcard readers. Three dollars per child was available for the purchase of incidental supplies.

The major thrust of the instructional program was to diagnose the learning needs of and to develop a prescription for each child. A classroom management system to facilitate individualization and a support system to indicate appropriate supplementary activities for each prescription were major components of AT-R.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

Although AT-R was implemented during October, the principal stated in his evaluation of the activity that the materials and equipment were late in arriving. He had also noted this problem in the previous year.

Staffing

The teacher was placed in AT-R after the start of the school year. The principal indicated that the teacher was very effective.

Inservice

The principal felt that the inservices were ineffective and not held often enough. The teacher did not record that any formal inservices were held but indicated that the consultations held at the school were very good.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

As previously stated, the principal was dissatisfied with the delivery of AT-R materials and equipment and the service of the vendor. The teacher, however, stated that the materials were adequate in quantity and excellent in quality. She was able to individualize instruction with the materials and was involved in the selection of the materials. In addition, she stated that correlation of the AT-R materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels was moderately easy. The teacher thought the activity was very effective and stated that she would like to teach in the activity the following year.

One board-funded classroom teacher completed a questionnaire and stated that pupils did not miss regular class work while attending AT-R. This teacher, however, felt that the pupils learned about the same amount as they would have learned in their regular class. She did note an increase on the part of the pupils in their effort to perform school related tasks. She was involved in the selection of the AT-R participants and was familiar with the methods and objectives of AT-R. The Title I teacher shared information concerning the pupils with the regular teacher by way of scheduled meetings.

Classroom Observations

The AT-R activity was observed during the fall. Pupils worked on seat work assignments using the activity machines, workbooks, worksheets, or writing paper. The teacher supervised the pupils and provided tutorial assistance when needed. The teacher was positive in the comments made to the pupils.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The Title I teacher stated that most of the parents were actively and cooperatively interested in the AT-R program. Twenty-two parents responded to a questionnaire. They were very positive toward the activity and felt that it should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The pupils' achievement as measured by the ITBS did not support the enthusiasm of the teacher and parents when compared to the achievement of pupils in other Title I reading activities. However, the progress that was made by the AT-R primary and some intermediate pupils was greater than that made by other Title I pupils of the same age level in that school. Overall, AT-R did not meet either the objective requiring a grade-equivalent gain of eight months or that requiring 60 percent of the pupils to obtain standard score gains.

Tabulations of the achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of the AT-R activity was $20,295. The cost per pupil was $677 and the cost per pupil contact hour was $5.74.

Given the achievement results, AT-R was not cost effective.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress in Reading was not an effective activity.

It is possible that the activity program had more merit than is apparent from this report in that review of outcomes for previous years (fiscal 1978 and 1979) show some commendable pupil progress. These positive results, however, were not enough to offset the negative aspects of the activity in that the number of children for which commendable gains were noted was very small.

The AT-R activity will be discontinued in fiscal 1981.

R&E #51
Project #618
Program #7651
Evaluator: George Dalin

IMPROVED READING ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH THE TEACHING OF TYPEWRITING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In its seventh year in Chicago's Title I project, Improved Reading Achievement Through the Teaching of Typewriting (TYPING) provided a minimum of 40 minutes of daily reading instruction to either 75 or 90 pupils in the fifth through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. There was a minimum of five classes held each day with class sizes varying from 10 to 20 pupils.

Twenty-three public schools and one private school purchased the activity which served a total of 2,175 pupils. There were 25 teachers and 25 aides assigned to the participating schools. Both teachers and aides received citywide and local school inservice from ESEA Title I reading coordinators.

Pupil participants were trained to develop visual memory for identifying word forms, to expand vocabulary, and to develop and reinforce listening skills. Skills needed to read and interpret directions were also emphasized. The typewriter was used as an instrument of response in teaching reading. Supplementary reading materials were selected by the local school staff. A minimum of $4 per pupil was provided for materials and $3.50 per pupil was provided for supplies.

ESEA Title I district coordinators and central office coordinators were available for inservice and technical assistance as specified in the guidelines.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

TYPING was selected, according to a majority of principals using it, because it had been effective at their schools in previous years and the activity's instructional emphasis and methods met the needs of their pupils. TYPING was felt to be a motivational technique for teaching reading to intermediate and upper age cycle pupils. Many principals cited this activity as excellent for vocabulary development, word attack skills, eye-hand coordination, and typing skills.

Initiation of Instruction

Pupils were selected on the basis of their Continuous Progress levels and 1978 ITBS scores. On the average, pupils were two years below their expected reading levels. Class instruction began before mid-September in a majority of the participating schools. However, a few principals reported problems in obtaining instructional materials, equipment, and board supplies. Pupils' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) were prepared by non-Title I teachers or jointly by Title I teachers and non-Title I teachers. In a few schools principals reported that some of their teachers resisted preparing ILPs because of the additional paper work. Monitoring of the ILPs was done by Title I school coordinators, principals, and/or classroom teachers.

Staffing

Teachers and teacher aides were assigned at the beginning of the school year without any major problems. Most activity teachers were experiended Title I teachers. A majority of the principals who were interviewed believed that their TYPING teachers and teacher aides were effective in classroom instruction.

Inservice

TYPING teachers rated the various activity inservice meetings as good or very good. On-site consultations by district Title I staff also received the same rating from the majority of the activity teachers. Inservice meetings did help improve their classroom instruction. The activity teacher aides also rated inservice meetings and on-site consultations as good. Principals rated inservice meetings and on-site consultations as above average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

All observed TYPING classes were operating in individual classrooms. Most of the school facilities as well as the physical atmosphere of the TYPING classrooms were above average for Title I. All of the surveyed activity teachers indicated that materials were provided in adequate quantity and the quality of these materials was excellent. Teachers were able to individualize instruction. In comparison to other Title I activities many more teachers were involved with the selection of materials. This factor may account for the ease in correlating TYPING materials with Chicago's CP/ML levels. This was not the case for many of Title I activities in fiscal 1980.

Only one public school was new to this activity in fiscal 1980 and typewriters were delivered in time for early implementation. New schools have had problems procuring typewriters in past years.

Efficiency of Operation

More than 80 percent of the observed activity teachers were rated as above average in adapting lessons to their pupils' levels. A majority of these teachers (90%) were rated above average in organizing instruction content. This was reflected by their giving assignments and directions in a clear and definite manner. Overall, the teacher implementation of the activity was effective in a majority of obseved classrooms.

In 82 percent of the observed TYPING classrooms, pupils started their lessons on time and displayed a high degree of self-control. More than half of the observed activity teachers allowed their pupils to voice their opinions on activity lessons and at least half of these teachers seemed to individualize pupils' reading.

Pupil Response

Activity teachers indicated that 81 percent of their pupils were actively and cooperatively interested in the TYPING activity. This rating was above the Title I average. Non-Title I teachers who sent pupils to the TYPING activity reported that 34 percent of their pupils increased their service to the school; 54 percent showed a positive change in personal responsibility; and 68 pecent demonstrated an increase in academic effort. Although these were positive pupil attitude changes, the activity's pupil's attitude gains did not meet the pupil objective of 70 percent of the demonstrating positive attitudinal change.

Title I and Regular Staff Communications

All of the TYPING teaches communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' reading progress. Sixty percent of the TYPING teachers met weekly with the non-Title I teachers while 20 percent met daily and 20 percent met monthly. A majority of these meetings (89%) were held informally. More than 90 percent of the surveyed non-Title I teachers indicated that the TYPING teachers shared information on each child's ILP.

Communication between the TYPING teachers and the School Community Representatives was evident in many of the participating schools. More than 80 percent of the TYPING teachers were made aware of their pupils' home situation, but only 56 percent of these teachers reported that they were made aware of their pupils' instructional needs.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Thirty-two percent of the parents were rated by TYPING teachers as actively and cooperatively interested in the activity. Approximately 50 percent of the parents were interested but not active. This was a higher percentage than most Title I activities.

Pupils received additional support from their parents. Parents who were surveyed (92%) indicated that they assisted their children with their homework assignments daily or weekly. Ninety percent of these parents thought the TYPING activity was very effective.

Eighty-three percent of the surveyed parents were aware that their children participated in the TYPING activity. This percent fell short of the objective that 90 percent would be aware of their children's TYPING participation.

However, 96 percent of the parents indicated that they visited their children's regular classroom or teacher. Approximately 70 percent of the parents visited their children's special Title I classroom or teacher. The percent who visited classrooms or teachers exceeded the stated objective of 65 percent.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The overall reading achievement gains for the TYPING activity are reported in Table 1.

A further analysis as to which age cycles met the objective of 60 percent having standard score gains in reading comprehension revealed that pupils at age cycles 10, 13, and 14 met the objective. The average grade-equivalent gain in reading comprehension for pupils at age cycles 12, 13, and 14 was at least 8 months. It should be noted that 18 of the 24 participating schools showed at least an eight month gain in reading comprehension. The average grade equivalent gains for the participating schools ranged from five to 17 months. Only age cycle 10 pupils exceeded the goal of 60 percent of pupils having a standard score gain in vocabulary. Age cycles 10, 12, and 13 pupils had at least an eight month gain in vocabulary. Therefore, two of the three reading objectives were successfully met.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=1763)

Obejctive	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	55%	no
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	63%	yes
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	9 mos.	yes

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated cost per pupil of TYPING was $444 or $3.80 per pupil contact hour. This activity ranked second as having the lowest in cost per pupil among laboratory reading activities. Taking into account the consistency of reading achievement gains over the years, the TYPING activity has been an effective approach to reading. Schools have had the option with this activity to purchase reading materials which suit their pupils' reading skill needs. Many principals viewed this activity as a motivational approach for teaching reading as well as for teaching typing skills.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

The TYPING activity was an effective laboratory approach to reading. Achievement gains were at least seven months for vocabulary and at least eight months in reading comprehension for pupils at age cycles ten and above.

Over the years, pupils have consistently achieved gains averaging from seven to nine months. Upper age cycle pupils have achieved greater reading achievement gains than intermediate age cycle pupils. Pupils' attitudes changed positively toward school, self, and school work but the activity failed to meet the pupil attitude objectives. Pupils appeared to respond favorably to the activity format and teachers were responsive to pupils' needs. Many parents were receptive to the activity and visited TYPING classes.

The TYPING staff and principals felt that inservice meetings were beneficial. Activity teachers worked well with the non-Title I teachers who sent pupils to the activity. Both groups of teachers kept each other informed on their pupils' reading progress. Principals generally believed that their activity teachers and teacher aides were qualified and that many of their pupils increased their social and academic skills because of the TYPING activity. Therefore, this Title I activity met the needs of many of the pupil participants, especially upper age cycle pupils who needed a motivational component to increase their reading skills.

RECOMMENDATION

Inservice meetings should continue to present innovative ideas on teaching reading techniques by the use of the typewriter.

Greater positive pupil attitude changes toward school could be achieved if the pupils could use the TYPING laboratory before and after school. This could be a time when they might type their homework assignments or work on additional reading skills. Supervision could be provided by the teacher aide.

This Title I activity has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils in need of a motivational component, especially for upper level pupils. It is recommended for selection by local schools to replace activities not producing desired effects.

R&E #71
Project #566
Program #7671
Evaluator: Earl Clendenon

HOFFMAN'S ME-DIA SYSTEM: READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Hoffman ME-dia System (ME-R) activity could serve pupils from kindergarten through the eighth year of school beyond kindergarten. Five or ten learning stations, each equipped with the Hoffman teaching machine, comprise the main feature of the learning laboratory. A phonograph record synchronized with a filmstrip lesson is inserted into the machine. The pupils follow the lesson by listening through headphones.

These basic lessons are essentially skill-building instruction based upon excerpts from children's literature and conceptual elements of social studies, science, and other elementary school subjects. The machine lessons are reinforced through workbook exercises, structured tasks requiring the use of oral and written language responses, and the reading of storybooks. Individualized placement within the sixty study units at each instructional level is based upon a skills inventory and diagnostic tests administered by the teacher.

At the primary level a Parent Involvement Program is provided. Using a manual of suggestions and procedures, the parent learns to assist the child at home in practicing skills correlated with the Hoffman program.

In fiscal 1980 ME-R was used by 11 public and five non-public schools. Approximately 1000 pupils were served.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Activity Selection and Implementation

The Hoffman ME-dia System activity was selected by four schools in fiscal 1979 and by 16 schools in fiscal 1980. The extraordinary increase was due to evaluation reports that ranked this activity highest among Chicago ESEA Title I programs in effecting reading achievement gain scores. But several other criteria also influenced the selection. Principals of the 16 schools mentioned particularly, in interviews, that the activity provided individually prescribed instruction for small groups and materials well suited to the needs of the pupils who were chosen to participate. These pupils were rather evenly distributed across the primary, intermediate, and upper levels, with some concentration from the third through the fifth year beyond kindergarten.

A Hoffman mathematics option was offered but was not selected by any Title I schools in fiscal 1980.

Although the Hoffman activity was a new installation in 12 schools, all the principals and all the activity teachers but one reported the instruction had begun well before the October 15, 1979 deadline for getting Title I activities fully implemented. Two principals mentioned delays in the completion of the delivery of materials; but, in the light of the usual performance of program vendors confronted with many simultaneous new installations, it may be said that delivery of the Hoffman activity materials was efficient. However, one teacher observed that budget provisions for the maintenance of the audiovisual machines and for the replacement of worn or lost materials were inadequate, as was the service pertinent to these needs. This unsolicited commit, though made by only one teacher, may point to a weakness that should be corrected.

Space, Materials, and Equipment

During the fall of 1979 field evaluators reported that the Hoffman activity was adequately implemented at 10 out of the 11 sites that were visited. That is, the materials and equipment in view and the teachers' management of the program conformed to expectations based upon the activity description. At two sites the activity space was shared regularly with another class, and converted but ample basement areas or a teachers' lounge were used at three sites. Housing this activity in space other than standard classrooms reflects its adaptability to the shortage of classrooms in some schools. (This adaptability is often a criterion of considerable importance when Title I programs are selected.)

When 10 activity sites were visited in the spring of 1980, the observers rated the teacher's implementation effort at or above the midpoint of a five-point scale; that is, they were rated "sound implementation" or "apparent successful implementation for all pupils."

Seven of the 11 teachers who returned questionnaires added comments describing the need to supplement the Hoffman materials with other workbooks, forms, and instructional aides in order to make the program run smoothly.

Staffing

The principals of schools that selected the Hoffman activity in fiscal 1980 reported no problems in providing teachers for the 17 units, 12 of which also employed aides. Questionnaire responses in the spring of 1980 indicated that only one teacher and one aide had been assigned to their positions for less than six months. Apparently this activity was not deeply involved in the mid-year school reorganizations caused by severe cuts in Board of Education personnel.

One pervasive problem related to activity staffing did, however, seriously affect the operation of Hoffman laboratories. Seven of 12 teachers who returned questionnaires reported that their classes were cancelled on 10 or more occasions during the year; in four cases the number was 20 or more cancellations. The predominant cause of the excessive cancellations was the use of Hoffman teachers to substitute for regular classroom teachers who were absent.

Inservice

Questionnaire responses regarding the number of Hoffman activity inservice meetings the teachers and aides attended confirmed the program vendor's compliance with staff training provisions of the activity proposal. The teachers' and aides' ratings of the quality of the meetings were predominatly good or very good. One or two of the their comments suggested that more training than could be provided in three meetings was desired.

Observations by evaluation staff members, as well as a comment from one teacher, indicated a need for more detailed presentations dealing with the content of the program materials, as opposed to presentations dealing with program management.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Role of the Aide

Typically, the aide's duties in a learning laboratory include checking the pupils' classwork and helping small groups or individual pupils with learning tasks, minor behavior problems, and personal needs. Only six of 12 Hoffman activity aides returned questionnaires, but their responses about their duties conformed to this pattern. The aides estimated that more than half their time was spent in direct relationships with pupils. These data were in agreement with corresponding data from the teachers' questionnaires and from the classroom observations.

The Hoffman program entails much systematic checking of the pupils' answers to questions and rechecking of the corrected work, in combination with the development of oral and written language skills. The teachers' awareness of the importance of the aides' assistance was reflected in the aides' unanimously positive judgments of their rapport with their teachers:

-The teachers' directions to the aides were clear.

-The teachers showed confidence in the aides' skills.

-The aides felt comfortable enough with their teachers to discuss problems with them and to make suggestions regarding the operation of the program.

In the spring of 1980 observers visited 10 Hoffman activity sites. Their ratings of the following classroom climate characteristics averaged 3.92 on a five-point scale:

-Instruction clear, well organized, and relevant to activity objectives

-Physical appearance of classroom conducive to learning and generating pride

-Class routines conducive to self-control, minimal loss of time on task, and minimal disturbance

-Teacher's management of pupils' behavior firm, fair friendly, and alert to pupils' needs for attention.

Only one out of 40 ratings comprising the above average of 3.92 was below the midpoint of the scale. High average ratings on the above characteristics were not unusual among learning laboratory activities, but it was unusual that during the fall visits to Hoffman sites several observers wrote notes praising the attractiveness of the rooms and the efficiency of the teachers.

INSTRUCTION PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS

Observations of the pupils' activities in Hoffman laboratories, during the spring of 1980, conformed to expectations. Predominantly the pupils were working independently on individually prescribed assignments or participating in small-group activities conducted by the teacher or aide. The predominance of these patterns of learning was typical of learning laboratory programs. But the data indicating that pupils in the Hoffman activity were often "waiting" (10 percent of the observations), as when they were standing in line to get their worked checked, highlighted the teachers' criticisms of the program materials. Seven out of 11 teachers who returned questionnaires reported that they had supplemented the activity materials for one or more of the following reasons:

- -To provide additional practice on reading comprehension skills
- -To provide instruction and practice on Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning curriculum skills required for the reading levels of their pupils
- -To provide meaningful things for the pupils to do while waiting to have their Hoffman program work checked.

These comments in the questionnaires supported those the teachers expressed at the inservice meetings. Besides supplying the pupils' need for additional practice work, the teachers also devised their own record-keeping systems and modified the program management procedures. Although ingenuity and flexibility are desirable traits in Title I teachers, it appeared to the evaluator that some of the extra work of the Hoffman teachers and aides should be eliminated by increasing the variety and quantities of the activity materials.

Pupil Response

The program management problems discussed above had no obvious effect on the pupils' interest in working. In the spring of 1980, the pupils' concentration on their tasks was rated "attentive, alert" in 72 percent of the observations and "average" or better in 98 percent of the observations. Observers noted that even while waiting for the teachers' attention the pupils were orderly and cooperative.

In questionnaire responses 12 activity teachers estimated that the participation of their pupils could be described as "actively interested." Although one of eight non-Title I teachers whose pupils were participants in ME-R felt that the activity did not challenge the pupils sufficiently to be beneficial, seven other respondents attributed some increase of their pupils' academic effort to participation in the Hoffman activity.

Staff Communication

All the Hoffman activity teachers who returned questionnaires reported that they regularly talked with the sending teachers about their pupils' progress. Usually this communication occurred informally at least once a week. Most of the sending teachers who returned questionnaires confirmed such sharing of information with the activity teachers and indicated that they understood the objectives of the program. However, only half of these respondents indicated that the Hoffman teacher had presented an orientation to the program for the non-Title I staff in their schools.

Although only eight sending teachers responded, the pertinent data, the tone of the comments, and some omissions of comments solicited in the questionnaire suggested that communication between these Title I teachers and the regular classroom teachers should be strengthened. One sending teacher particularly mentioned her desire for such communication. On the other hand, another sending teacher said: "This is the first time since I've had pupils in a Title I program that the teacher has shared information about the pupils."

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The teachers' estimates of parents' participation in the Hoffman activity were distributed approximately as follows:

Degree of Participation	Percent of Parents
Actively interested	40
Interested but not active	25
Not noticeably interested	35

The relatively high percentage categorized as actively interested probably reflects the use of the Hoffman program materials that engage parents in homework tasks with their primary-level children.

The number of parents who had visited a Hoffman laboratory during the year, voluntarily or upon request, to see about their child's progress ranged from fewer than 10 to more than 30; the average was 20 parents per teacher. Three of 10 parents who returned questionnaires (distributed to them through a random sample of Hoffman activity pupils) had visited the activity teacher at least once during the year. Other responses in the parents' questionnaires indicated highly positive attitudes toward the activity with regard to improving the child's interest in learning and also increasing the child's achievement. All but one of these parents felt the program should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

In fiscal 1980 the ITBS average grade-equivalent gain scores in reading comprehension for Hoffman participants were six months for primary and intermediate pupils and nine months for upper level pupils. The average grade-equivalent gain for all Hoffman pupils was seven months. Generally, these average gains were one month below the corresponding gains for all Title I pupils.

Sixty-two percent of the 122 upper level pupils for whom matched pre- and posttest ITBS scores were available attained standard-score gains in reading comprehension. The corresponding figure for primary pupils was 49 percent; for intermediate pupils the figure was 53 percent. Only the upper level pupils met the 60 percent criterion of the objective.

On the vocabulary subtest the mean grade-equivalent gain scores were five months for primary and intermediate pupils and eight months for upper cycle pupils. Forty-nine percent of all Hoffman pupils attained a standard-score gain on this subtest. The 60 percent criterion of the objective was not met, except for age cycles 13 and 14.

In the ranking of all learning laboratory activities on the basis of percentages of pupils with standard-score gains in reading comprehension, the Hoffman activity was not as favorably placed in fiscal 1980 as in the past. However, the average grade-equivalent gain recorded by ME-R over the past three years remained at eight months. On the basis of fiscal 1980 results, Hoffman appeared least effective for the intermediate age cycle.

Three-fourths of the Hoffman activity units were in the first year of operation in fiscal 1980. Instruction in learning laboratory programs does not usually reach its full potential in efficiency during the first year of operation.

Twenty-four six-year-old Hoffman pupils were tested with the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills using a posttest-only design. Forty-four percent of these pupils exceeded the fiftieth percentile in reading for pupils in the first year beyond kindergarten nationally. The 40 percent criterion of this objective was exceeded.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In fiscal 1980 Hoffman's cost per pupil ($713) was the highest among four comparable learning laboratory programs. Again, it should be remembered that 12 out of the 16 Hoffman laboratories were new installations; the cost of a new unit, in this type of activity, always is considerably more than that of a continuing unit.

Considering the effectiveness of this activity in the past in promoting reading achievement and allowing for the possible influence of a relatively high number of first-year units, it may be said that the Hoffman program probably remained cost-effective despite its average achievement results in fiscal 1980.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To summarize the salient points of the foregoing discussion, in fiscal 1980 the Hoffman ME-dia System activity:

-was efficiently implemented except for a few delivery delays associated with the sudden expansion of the program to 12 new sites;

-was efficiently managed even though a shortage of certain skill-practice materials necessitated exceptional amounts of preparation of additional materials by the teachers and aides;

-provided a program that maintained the interest of the participants and produced average standardized test results.

The following recommendations are submitted for the consideration of program administrators:

-negotiate a firm administrative policy to reduce the frequency of Title I class cancellations caused by the use of activity teachers as substitues in regular classrooms.

-find out from the activity teachers the specific shortages of materials they have encountered and revise the activity proposal to overcome them.

-provide more detailed consideration of the content of the program materials at inservice meetings. (It appeared that the management procedures have received sufficient emphasis.)

-retain the Hoffman ME-dia System among the activities offered in Reading: Top Priority.

R & E	#3, 5
Project	#568
Program	#7683
Evaluator:	Earl Clendenon

SYSTEM 80 PROGRAM: LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The System 80 Program served pupils from the kindergarten through the eighth year of school beyond kindergarten. Five or ten learning stations, each equipped with the Borg-Warner System 80 teaching machine, comprised the main feature of the learning laboratory. A phonograph record that gave direction to the pupil was synchronized with a slide of visual programmed instruction; both of these were inserted into the machine. The pupil responded by depressing a key under one of the response choices for each question or problem presented on the machine's projection screen.

Pupils who were able to complete one or two machine lessons before their session ended turned to instructional games or workbook lessons selected to reinforce concepts and skills learned on the machine, or to library-type books selected to encourage the enjoyment of reading.

The pupil's lesson sequence was prescribed individually through machine administered criterion-referenced pre- and posttests. The laboratory teacher, assisted by an aide in the ten-station units, monitored each pupil's progress on the machine and provided guidance in using profitably the instructional games and books.

For primary pupils an optional program, Sound Start, could be purchased to provide intensive teacher-directed training in beginning phonics. In these classes the pupils spent one session with the teacher working on Sound Start and the next session on the System 80 machine lessons.

In fiscal 1980 there were System 80 units in 14 public and two nonpublic schools; about 1,500 pupils were served.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Activity Selection and Implementation

Principals in explaining why particular Title I activities were purchased for their schools mentioned predominantly that the program materials and methods fit the needs of the pupils who were chosen to participate. Although this selection criterion was of the highest importance in purchasing the System 80 Program in fiscal 1980, the principals who were interviewed mentioned some other criteria several times. The activity was:

> considered to have been effective in the school in previous years,
>
> adequately accommodated in a space smaller than a standard size classroom,
>
> well suited to the instructional and managerial skills of the teacher selected to operate the program.

All thirteen of the principals who were interviewed reported that instruction was fully implemented by October 15, 1979. No problems associated with the delivery of materials or installation of equipment were reported. Some delay in getting the activity classes started was mentioned in one case, but this was caused by the time required to organize the total school schedule; full implementation was attained by the accepted deadline, October 15.

Space, Materials, and Equipment

Since the System 80 Program served only 10 pupils at a time in five groups per day and the teaching machines and software fit into limited space, this activity was sometimes selected over alternative laboratories that required more space. In the fall of 1979 observers found this activity operating in smaller than standard classrooms or some other "unusual" space at seven of the nine sites visited, but implementation of the program was reported to be adequate in every case. At eight sites during the following spring observers rated the teachers' use of the activity facilities and their management of the program above average on a five-point scale.

All of the 13 activity teachers responding to a questionnaire rated the activity materials adequate in quantity and good or, most often, excellent in quality. Most of the teachers indicated that the materials enabled them to individualize instruction easily "to the extent necessary." However, the distribution of responses regarding ease of relating the activity lessons to CPML levels was broader, ranging from one teacher who found this task very difficult to six teachers who found it very easy.

This activity was most frequently selected to serve pupils in the first five years beyond kindergarten. This was probably because the content of the materials originally purchased by those schools which continued the program was perceived to be especially appropriate for the younger pupils; also primary pupils quickly mastered the activity procedures.

Staff

No problems in staffing the System 80 Program were reported by the principals who were interviewed. Seven of 12 teachers and six of nine aides who returned questionnaires had worked in this activity for two years or longer. Most of the first-year assignments were associated with first-year installations of the activity in three schools. In June of 1980 only one staff member had been assigned to the System 80 Program for less than six months.

Evidently, staffing in this program was little affected by the extensive mid-year school reorganizations caused by cuts in Board of Education personnel.

Inservice

Both the teachers' and aides' confirmed that the staff training and inservice required of the activity were fulfilled. An average of five meetings attended agreed with that expected. The teachers most often rated the quality of the meetings good or very good; the aides most often rated the quality good. That 12 percent rated the meetings poor or fair suggested that some change in the content of the meetings or in the presentation might be desired.

The System 80 Program inservice meetings attended by evaluation staff in fiscal 1980 were well related to the teachers' program management needs: maintenance of the equipment, familiarity with the materials, and procedures for replacing or adding to the lesson units were among the topics covered. The efficiency of the vendor's consultant in clarifying and managing routine requirements of the program undoubtedly accounted for the absence of complaints in this activity about delivery and installation services.

Nine out of 10 teacher respondents indicated that the inservice meetings had contributed to improvement of instruction in their classrooms. The criterion that at least 75 percent of the teachers would report such improvement was attained.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Role of the Aide

None of the System 80 Program aides and only one of the teachers who returned questionnaires reported the aides' being regularly involved in work conflicting with duties in the activity.

Predominantly, the aides' tasks included checking the pupils' classwork, assisting individual pupils with learning, and supervising small groups working on assignments. The teachers' and the aides' responses, as well as observational data, agreed in the aides' usefulness in the instructional program.

The need for a well-trained aide who is not often absent was observed to be especially important in activity components which included the teacher-directed Sound Start phonics program.

Teacher Effects

In visits to eight System 80 Program laboratories during the spring of 1980, observers rated most of the sites above the midpoint of a five-point scale in the following classroom climate characteristics:

> instruction clear, well organized, and relevant to the activity objectives,
>
> physical appearance of the classroom conducive to learning and generating pride,
>
> classroom routines conducive to self-control, minimal loss of time, and minimal disturbance,
>
> teacher's management of pupils' behavior firm, fair, friendly, and alert to pupils' needs for attention.

The average rating in each case was four on a five-point scale. At least two sites were given the highest rating on each characteristic, and class routines were perceived to merit the highest rating at half the sites. The latter observation, indicating as it does the degree of on-task behavior and self-control, was especially revealing since primary pupils comprised a large majority of those observed.

Instructional Procedures and Problems

Since the System 80 Program provides individually prescribed instruction through machine-directed lessons, it was not surprising that 60 percent of the fall and spring observations of the pupils' activities indicated independent work on individualized assignments. Partial-class lessons, directed by the teacher or aide, comprised most of the other activities of the pupils. In particular, the Sound Start program required intensive oral direction by the teacher, while the aide supervised the other pupils working on the machines, using skill-building games, or enjoying storybooks.

Reading, as expected, was usually the lesson in progress during the observations. In fiscal 1980 there were two System 80 sites that used mathematics materials exclusively. These materials usually provided machine-directed drill on number facts and elementary quantitative relationships for intermediate and upper level pupils who needed to master these fundamentals.

Teacher-directed instruction to reinforce the machine lessons was a prescribed feature of this activity. The observational data reflected the expected apportionment of independent work on the machines and sessions with the teachers.

A few comments added to the teacher questionnaires indicated a need for more extensive paper-and-pencil practice work to supplement particular lessons introduced on the System 80 machine. For example:

> I find the program lacking in material that allows a child to apply and improve comprehension and computational skills. The library books and the games supplied are lovely, but I find the logistics of their use to be very limited by the forty-minute period. The workbooks do not contain enough concrete application.

This comment was from a teacher at a school where System 80 was in its first year of operation. Probably the desired materials were in fact available from the program vendor. The instructional materials for this activity can be expanded in subsequent years of operation. At this point, fiscal 1980, as the vendor's consultant advised at one of the inservice meetings, the older installations may need upgrading with replacements or extensions of the materials originally purchased.

Pupil Response

During the fall of 1979, ninety-two percent of the observations of pupils in System 80 laboratories indicated on-task behavior; that is, the observed pupils were diligently working on assignments. No off-task behavior was recorded; in eight percent of the observations the pupils were waiting for instruction or to have their work checked. At eight sites visited in the spring of 1980 observers rated the pupils' behavior "attentive, motivated" or "enthusiastic, concentrating" in 70 percent of the cases. Only four instances of "below average" attention were reported.

In questionnaire responses, 13 System 80 teachers indicated that the participation of 65 to 100 percent of their pupils could be described as "actively interested." Six teachers indicated that more than 95 percent were actively interested. Six other teachers estimated that only 10 percent or less of their 50 or 100 pupils were "not noticeably interested."

These data were consistent with those for other laboratory programs. The use of audiovisual equipment strongly engaged the pupils' interest. Coupled with that was the satisfaction of working independently on individually prescribed assignments and the motivation derived from machine-directed success.

Staff Communication

All the System 80 teachers who returned questionnaires reported regular communication with the teachers whose pupils participated in the activity. Most frequently this communication was characterized as occurring informally every day with one or another of the sending teachers. Ninety percent of the sending teachers indicated that they shared with the activity teacher information relevant to the pupils' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs). Nearly all of these teachers felt that System 80 correlated well with their school's curriculum. A majority also reported that the Title I teacher had provided an orientation to the activity's goals and procedures.

It may be said that communication between the System 80 teachers and the pupils' regular classroom teachers conformed to the activity requirements.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Nineteen parents returned questionnaires. Generally, at least 16 of the parents:

had visited the activity classroom at least once during the school year,

felt that their child had achieved more than would have been achieved without the program, felt that the program should be continued.

The activity teachers reported an average of 20 conferences with parents regarding pupils' progress, and characterized the participation of 43 percent of the parents as "actively interested"; 33 percent of the parents were said to be "interested but not active."

These data suggest a fair degree of parent awareness of this activity and general satisfaction among the teachers regarding the parents' involvement.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Tabulations of the data discussed in this section and explanations of the statistical terms used will be found in Volume 2 of this report.

On the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), System 80 pupils for whom matched pre- and posttest scores were available attained an average grade-equivalent gain of five months on the vocabulary portion of the reading test and four months on the reading comprehension portion.

On the latter subtest the averages were three, five, and six months OF gain for primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils respectively. About 80 percent of the reported number of activity participants had both pre- and posttest scores.

In fiscal 1980 pupils in this activity did not meet either of the objectives pertaining to reading achievement. The criteria were that the pupils would show an average of eight grade-equivalent months of gain in reading achievement after at least eight months of participation in the program and that 60 percent of the pupils would attain a standard score gain. Only 47 percent of the System 80 pupils had standard score gains in reading achievement, 50 percent in vocabulary.

The System 80 average gains were generally two or three grade-equivalent months lower than the corresponding gains for all Title I pupils. There was this exception: upper level pupils in this activity attained an average of nine months of gain on the vocabulary subtest. Sixty-one percent of this group achieved a standard score gain; the criterion of the objective in this case was met.

The reading achievement of 112 six-year-old System 80 participants was measured with the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Only 14 percent of these pupils exceeded the national median score for the corresponding age group.

The objective required 40 percent of the six-year-olds to exceed the national median score.

Looking at the ITBS mathematics gains for 186 System 80 pupils, the averages for the primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils agreed substantially with those for all Title I pupils. The average grade-equivalent gain for all System 80 participants in mathematics, like that for all Title I participants, was eight months. A total of 61 percent achieved standard score gains, exceeding the Title I average of 56 percent for mathematics.

Among eight comparable laboratory activities, the System 80 Program ranked sixth or seventh in the past three years with respect to producing standard score gains in reading comprehension. Fluctuations in these rankings occur. Since the prescribed instructional materials and procedures have not changed substantially from year to year, the most important causes of the fluctuations probably are school, teacher, and pupil-selection effects. However, System 80 from fiscal 1978 to fiscal 1980 produced only five months of grade-equivalent gain annually in reading comprehension, compared with seven months of gain generally for Title I laboratory activities over the same period.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In fiscal 1980 System 80 had the lowest estimated cost per pupil ($476) among four comparable laboratory programs. As mentioned earlier, the equipment and materials of this activity are physically compact (a result of their design and intentional limitation on the part of the vendor). Principals consider the adaptability of the program to a small classroom space and to various instructional levels, in reading and mathematics, to be an asset.

Looking at cost and reading achievement for fiscal 1980, this activity appeared to be less desirable than comparable activities. For mathematics, System 80 was somewhat more cost-effective. Program selection committees should carefully assess the materials and procedures and, if planning to continue the program, the results obtained in their particular schools.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To summarize the preceding discussion, the evaluation data clearly showed that in fiscal 1980 the System 80 Program was typically:

better than adequately implemented with regard to staffing and the initiation of instruction,

well supplied with materials and equipment that were delivered on time and efficiently maintained,

efficiently managed throughout the year by the teachers and aides,

highly effective in engaging the interest of the pupils and in developing their self-confidence in learning,

less effective in producing standard score gains in reading achievement than comparable laboratory activities.

The following recommendations are submitted for the consideration of program administrators:

make provisions in the budget for annual upgrading of the materials in continuing activity units and monitor the teachers' suggestions and needs in this matter.

System 80, as currently implemented, is only occasionally capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils. In general, if a more effective activity is available, replacement is recommended particularly for the reading components.

R&E #01 & 02
Project #627
Program #7652
Evaluator: Earl Clendenon

PRESCRIPTION LEARNING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Prescription Learning (PL) activity provides a laboratory equipped for the management of individually prescribed instruction in reading or mathematics for pupils from the second through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten.

The prescription for each pupil is printed out after a computerized analysis of the pupil's placement test. For each skill weakness identified, the prescription lists one or more sources of study and practice work available to the pupil in the laboratory. The pupil's choices from the items listed in his or her prescription and the progress through them are guided by the teacher.

Instructional materials include workbooks with self-correcting keys, sequenced learning kits for use in various projection and listening devices, instructional games, and library-type books selected to meet the interests of the participating pupils without exceeding their reading ability. The teacher may augment the laboratory materials with books, games, or other instructional materials that are perceived to enchance the pupils' opportunities for or interest in learning.

A Prescription Learning unit may serve 60, 75, or 110 pupils; units with 75 or 110 pupils include the assistance of an aide.

Extensive inservice training in understanding the educational philosophy behind Prescription Learning and in managing the program is provided for the teachers and aides.

In fiscal 1980 Prescription Learning units operated in 102 public and 21 nonpublic schools. Approximately 13,845 pupils were served.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Pupil Selection

In fiscal 1980 principals interviews and teacher questionnaires often mentioned that the Prescription Learning activity was selected for their schools because its materials and learning procedures were distinctly different from those of the regular classrooms. This feature, coupled with the activity's individualized instructional system, was said to benefit especially intermediate and upper level pupils with histories of low interest and lagging progress in conventional classrooms. The principals also indicated PL was considered to have been effective in their schools in previous years and fitted in well with the regular classroom reading and/or mathematics programs.

Activity Implementation

Only one of the 28 principals who were interviewed reported that PL was not fully implemented in his school by October 15, 1979. (That is, instruction for all pupils enrolled in the activity had not started by that date in this case.) Information from the activity teachers and from some non-Title I teachers whose pupils participated in the program implied that not getting instruction started two or three weeks earlier than October 15 was associated with delays in settling the total school organization (and consequently in selecting PL participants), delays in completing the activity placement testing, and, for first-year installations, delays in completing the delivery of materials to the activity laboratory. A few sending teachers mentioned also the inconvenience such delays caused them in establishing routines in their own classrooms.

It can be said that there were few problems in getting PL fully implemented before the October 15 deadline but school staff members agreed that better avoidance of the above-mentioned delays was desired.

Space, Materials, and Equipment

Observations in 90 PL laboratories during the fall of 1979 indicated that the space was shared with another class at approximately one-fifth of the sites. At nine sites the space was categorized as unusual; that is, the room was considerably smaller than a regular classroom, a corridor, or some other converted area. Noise from the other class in shared facilities, even when the room was large enough to accommodate two classes comfortably, was sometimes distracting. One PL teacher in a shared classroom reported that she had devised procedures that minimized her need to instruct her pupils by speaking to them. Clearly, this activity, with its wide variety of materials, equipment, and learning procedures, needs a full-sized classroom by itself for efficient arrangement of storage areas and study centers and for unhampered independent movement among the pupils.

In the fall classroom observations implementation at 97 percent of the sites visited by field evaluators was judged to be adequate. Ratings of the teachers' success in using the laboratories and managing the program, as reported in observations at 77 sites during the spring of 1980, indicated that in all cases the degree of implementation exceeded the minimum expected by the observers. There was "better than sound implementation" in 40 percent of the cases.

All but five of 108 PL teachers, in questionnaire responses, indicated that the quantity of materials provided was adequate and 94 percent of the respondents rated the quality excellent or good. Comments on deficiencies most often mentioned a shortage of practice exercises on reading comprehension skills and the difficulty of adequately matching lessons in some of the materials with designated skills in the Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning curriculum. The vendor had provided this matching for some of the reading materials through codes included in the pupils' computerized learning prescriptions. Most frequently the deficiencies were noticed in materials above the primary level. No comparable deficiencies were mentioned for materials used in the PL mathematics laboratories.

Staff

In fiscal 1980 there were 179 PL teachers and 123 aides, reflecting an increase of roughly one-fifth in the number of units purchased compared with the previous year. About 32 percent of the teachers and 43 percent of the aides who returned questionnaires had worked in this activity for one year or less. Four percent of the teachers and 12 percent of the aides had been assigned to their positions for less than six months. About one-third of the teachers reported that their aides had been working in their particular classrooms for less than six months.

These data reflect to some extent the pervasive school staff re-organizations caused in midyear by severe cuts in Board of Education personnel and the consequent shuffling of positions to comply with considerations of seniority. The changes and uncertainties affected the continuity of PL instruction at many sites. (One teacher was first removed from her position and then reassigned to it several weeks later. In the meantime the activity classes were discontinued.) However, other data, discussed in later sections of this report, suggested that the level of competence among teachers and aides in this activity did not suffer.

Delays in assigning aides to activity components serving the 75 or 110 pupil options inevitably made the operation of the program less efficient than was planned. In some cases, for example, teachers without aides spent about ten minutes of every instruction period escorting pupils to and from their regular classrooms.

Twenty percent of the teachers and 32 percent of the aides who returned questionnaires indicated that the aides were involved every day in some duties that conflicted with their duties in the activity classrooms. Although nearly half of the respondents reported no such conflicts at any time during the year, the proportion of aides who lost daily some of the time reserved for working in the activity seems excessive.

The PL teachers' reports on the number of times one or more of their classes were cancelled pointed to another conspicuous problem. Even allowing that an average of six class cancellations might have been caused by the required attendance at activity inservice meetings, as the data suggested, it remains that 27 percent of 118 respondents indicated more than 10 class cancellations, and about one-fifth indicated from 15 to 35 cancellations. Most frequently the cancellations (in excess of those due to activity inservice meetings) were caused by the teachers' being called upon to serve as substitutes for regular classroom teachers who were absent. Sometimes the substitute service was only for the first hour of the morning, until an official substitute arrived, but not infrequently the service was for an entire day. From these data it may be inferred that many PL pupils, though reported to be enrolled for 10 months, received considerably less than 10 months of contact with the program.

Inservice Training

Questionnaire reponses indicated that the teachers attended an average of six inservice meetings conducted by PL consultants. This figure and an average of 18 on-site consultations per teacher confirm that the program vendor complied with the staff training provisions of the activity. Both the teachers and aides rated the quality of the meetings good or, most frequently, very good. Ninety percent of the teachers reported that the inservice training had contributed to improvements in instruction in their classrooms. Hence, the objective stating that at least 75 percent of the teachers would report such improvements as a consequence of attending inservice meetings was substantially exceeded.

Observations of a few of the meetings by evaluation staff generally supported the participants' opinions. The PL consultants were efficient in planning and managing agenda that kept well over a hundred teachers and aides, at each meeting, engaged in meaningful professional activities for the full day. Unavoidably, the size of the groups and the necessary movement now and then resulted in some loss of "on-task" time, but the consultants' endeavors to minimize such losses were consistently in evidence.

Comments on making the inservice meetings even more profitable, as reported in questionnaires and informal interviews, ran as follows:

> Teachers of PL mathematics components desire occasional attention to their interests at meetings planned exclusively for them.
>
> Aides desire some training devoted exclusively to their needs. Child development and managing behavior problems were mentioned among topics on which they would appreciate training geared to their role in the activity.
>
> Teachers who have worked in the program for more than three years occasionally expressed a feeling of boredom regarding the inservice meeting agenda. Some of them felt that they no longer needed to attend as many inservice meetings as continuing teachers with less than four years of experience in the activity.

These inservice programs were composed of expert variations on basic themes of the PL concept: efficient management of the pupils' learning tasks, familiarity with the activity equipment and the content of the materials, and, above all, understanding and reaching out to the affective needs of children: helping them develop a secure sense of personal worth, self-confidence, and pride in their accomplishments.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Role of the Aide

Apart from escorting pupils to and from the activity room (in schools where the distances and the pupils' ages made this necessary), the PL aides were most frequently observed checking pupils' classwork or updating records, supervising the learning tasks of small groups, and assisting pupils individually with learning tasks.

In addition, 53 of 64 aides who responded indicated daily involvement in assisting pupils with minor behavioral problems or personal needs. A very large majority (over 90 percent) estimated that half or more than half of their time was spent in direct relationships with pupils and that the activity teachers had confidence in the aides' skills. Only seven percent of the aides felt that their responsibilities in the activity room were insufficient.

The teachers' estimates of the distribution of the aides' duties, though generally more conservative, agreed proportionally with the aides' estimates. The two groups agreed also in their comments on the aides' less frequent and unusual services: helping in communications with the parents, managing the activity when the teacher was absent, training a new teacher in operating the program, and even providing "moral support" to counter occasional lapses of one teacher's optimism.

Obviously, the aides in this activity, in their own as well as the teachers' valuations, were competent and made outstanding contributions to the instructional program.

PL Teacher Effectiveness

The comments of teachers who send pupils to PL were sometimes coupled with praise for the activity teachers' conscientious efforts. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high), 78 PL teachers were rated 4 on each of the following classroom climate characteristics:

> Instruction was clear, well organized, and relevant to activity objectives
>
> Physical appearance of the classroom was conducive to learning and generating pride
>
> Classroom routines was conducive to self-control, minimal loss of time on task, and minimal disturbance

> Teacher's management of pupils' behavior was firm, fair, friendly, and alert to the pupils' needs for attention.

It is worth noting that for the above characteristics, on the average, only three percent of the ratings were below the midpoint of the scale while 26 percent were at the highest point.

Instruction Procedures and Problems

Prescription Learning materials and management procedures are designed to maximize the pupils' independent pursuit of individually prescribed learning tasks. The predominance of this program feature was reflected in the evaluation data. In 76 percent of the fall observations, the pupils were working on individualized assignments. Whole-class and partial-class lessons (about 10 percent of the observations) usually consisted of teacher-directed instruction on isolated skills, another feature expected of this activity.

Predominantly the observed pupils were using workbooks or learning kits, often in conjunction with the associated audiovisual devices. The PET minicomputer, added to PL laboratories in fiscal 1980, was observed to cause some loss of time on task while the machine transmitted lesson elements to the display screen, but the computer was instantly popular among the pupils. Many teachers welcomed it as a way of granting three or [illegible] pupils each period a rewarding change from their routine work.

Observers frequently noted that PL classrooms were attractively arranged and colorfully decorated. Wall space was ingeniously used to post the individualized assignment cards and class progress records. "Moti," the program vendor's symbol for Motivation, smiled from posters, swaying mobiles, and even reading-corner pillows.

A part of the cost of materials for keeping the activity rooms inviting was borne personally by the teachers, as a few comments in the questionnaires revealed. Moreover, some remarks in staff interviews indicated that these teachers were occasionally omitted in the distribution of board-funded classroom supplies, since their rooms were well stocked with the prescribed activity materials. But no program handicaps caused by a lack of consumable supplies from board-funded sources were reported.

Pupil Response

During the fall of the school year, 92 percent of the pupils in PL laboratories were on task; that is, working diligently on their assignments. Only two percent of the observations indicated off-task behavior; neutral behavioral classifications comprised the remaining six percent. In the spring, the pupils' behavior was rated "on task" in 97 percent of the observations and "above average" in concentration on working in 67 percent of the cases.

In visits to 78 classrooms for average periods of 20 minutes the observers encountered only four instances of "completely off-task" behavior. Many of the pupils' regular classroom teachers agreed that the pupils enjoyed PL and often showed improvement in self-confidence and independence in learning, which these teachers attributed to the PL program.

Nearly 90 percent of the activity teachers who returned questionnaires indicated that their pupils' participation in the activity could be described as "actively interested."

PL was apparently quite successful in maintaining the pupils' interest in the materials, equipment, and procedures. Cases of pupils on the activity waiting list pleading persistently to be enrolled and of pupils venting disappointment when they are replaced annually by those more in need of the program were often reported.

Staff Communication

In fiscal 1979 and 1980 Title I evaluation staff and district activity coordinators cooperated in emphasizing the importance of relating instruction in the Title I programs to instruction in the regular classrooms. The basis of this emphasis was the requirement that every Title I pupil should have an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) initiated and maintained through regular conferences between the teachers regarding the pupil's learning deficiencies and progress.

In fiscal 1980 a very large majority of the PL teachers indicated that they had established such communication with the regular classroom teachers of their pupils. It was indicated that this communication was predominantly informal and occurred at least once a week or once a month. This information was confirmed by a similarly large majority of non-Title I teachers whose pupils were enrolled in this activity. They reported sharing information regularly with PL teachers.

Nearly three-fourths of the non-Title I teachers whose questionnaire responses specifically mentioned this activity said that the PL teacher had given a special presentation, at a faculty meeting, for example, to improve their understanding of the activity goals and procedures.

These data support the conclusion that the ILP requirement and the communication on which it depended were generally well implemented in PL.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Two-thirds of the 22 parents who returned questionnaires indicated that they had visited the activity classroom. Most of the parents, too, had helped their child with homework every day or several times a week and felt that their child had achieved more than would have been achieved without the benefit of the program. Of the teachers who returned questionnnaires, one-third indicated that parents of their pupils were "actively interested" in the program, while about half of the teachers indicated that the parents were "interested but not active."

About one-third of 118 teachers reported that more than 15 parents of their pupils had come to the school for conferences about their children's progress. The number of parents who had visited the PL laboratory at least once during the year, as on an open-house evening, ranged over 50 in seven responses.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this seciton and explanations of the statistical terms used will be found in Volume 2 of this report.

Pupils in PL reading components and in the mathematics components, too, attained an average gain of eight grade-equivalent months on the citywide standardized tests. Hence, the objective of eight months' gain in achievement after no less than eight months' participation in the program was met. These results were obtained from matched pre- and posttest scores that were available for about 80 percent of the reported number of participants.

As in Title I testing results generally, the average gain score for upper level pupils (10 months) was higher than that for primary or intermediate level pupils (seven months in each case). There was a corresponding difference in the percentages of pupils who had attained a positive standard score gain; it was the upper level pupils who generally met or exceeded the 60 percent criterion with regard to positive standard score gains.

COST EFFECTIVENSS

The cost per pupil of the PL activity, $620 in fiscal 1980, slightly exceeded that of most similar laboratory programs. This was due partly to the greater variety of materials and equipment in this activity and partly to the cost of the intensive inservice program and on-site consultant services. Given its great popularity, the total estimated cost for PL was $8,570,070. This was higher than any other Title I activity. However, its cost on a per pupil contact hour was average for Title I laboratory activities.

The activity was often selected, according to principals' comments, because it could be structured and staffed to serve all levels of pupils in reading and/or mathematics and serve 60, 75, or 110 pupils. The principals in general perceived these features to be cost-effective.

In fiscal 1980, PL's average costs and average achievement gains indicated that it was about average in terms of cost-effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data presented in this report support the following general conclusions regarding the PL activity in fiscal 1980:

Initial and full implementation of instruction was efficiently attained

Materials and equipment were adequate in quantity and quality

Operation of the program was better than the minimal degree of efficiency expected

Pupils showed a consistent interest in the program and exceptional independence in pursuing highly individualized learning tasks

Pupil achievement gains supported the view that this activity is reasonably cost effective

The following recommendations are submitted for the consideration of the program administrators:

Retain PL among the activities offered in to Chicago's Title I schools.

Constrain the addition of increasingly eclectic materials to the program unless benefits can be clearly demonstrated

Require the vendor to extend and improve the correlation of lessons in the activity materials with Continuous Progress/Mastery Learning curriculum skills

Consider reducing the inservice training requirements, not only to reduce the activity unit cost but also to reduce some staff resistance to the meetings.

In summary, one PL aide added this comment to a questionnaire:

> PL is a fantastic program. The children are motivated to come to school. Their attitudes toward themselves and school work are signs of the effectiveness of the program and also of the teacher that makes the lab a nice comfortable place for the children.

The data and other comments collected in fiscal 1980 suggest that a large majority of the activity teachers, the sending teachers, and the other aides would agree with that statement.

R&E #92 & 93
Project #648
Program #7692
Evaluator: Marion Rice

HIGH INTENSITY CENTERS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980 the High Intensity Centers in reading (HIC-R) and in mathematics (HIC-M) enrolled approximately 1,300 pupils in fourteen public and two non-public schools using materials of the High Intensity Reading Management Program published by Random House, Inc. The program, in its ninth year of operation in fiscal 1980, served pupils in the first through eighth years of school beyond kindergarten.

All but two of the Centers focused on reading. Staffing was to consist of one teacher and one aide for 75 pupils or a teacher alone for 50 pupils. Teachers were to schedule five or more class sessions per day, and pupils were to attend one period daily for 30 to 40 minutes depending on their level: primary, intermediate, or upper.

The Centers were organized into several stations for reading or mathematics activities. Pupils used workbooks and other printed materials from Random House, learning kits, cassette tape and filmstrip players, and library-type books in settings which were often ingeniously arranged to promote individualized learning. The Centers were all housed in separate rooms or areas.

Inservice was provided in September 1979 to introduce new teachers and aides to the materials and to allow continuing staff members to review the program. Other inservice meetings were held at appropriate intervals throughout the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The main reasons for selecting HIC included: the activity had been effective at the school in previous years, its instructional emphasis and methods best met the needs of pupils in the school, and it best used the talents of the school's staff.

Initiation of Instruction

Generally speaking, no difficulties were reported in beginning instruction on time; however, a couple of reasons were cited for late implementation, including instructional materials not delivered and equipment installation problems.

HIC teachers found it moderately easy to correlate materials with for Chicago CP/ML levels.

Staffing

In most schools there were no major staffing problems. One school reported a late staff assignment. Principals rated staff above average for HIC-R and very effective for HIC-M.

The 12 HIC-R teachers responding to a questionnaire had an average of 3.5 years of experience in the activity. Eighty-two percent of the teachers wanted to continue teaching this activity the following year; this was slightly less than the 94 percent found in other laboratory activities. For HIC-M, the one responding teacher indicated 2.75 years of experience with the activity. This teacher also wanted to continue teaching in the activity.

For those HIC-R teachers who received the services of a SCR or home visitor, 66 percent felt that they were more aware of their Title I pupils' home situation. The HIC-M teacher was also more aware of the Title I pupils' home situations.

Seventy-six percent of the of 12 HIC aides responding to a questionnaire were in their first year with the activity; this percentage was consistent with that observed in other activities. All of the aides felt that the teacher's directions regarding their duties were very clear. In HIC-R, 10 of the 11 aides felt that the teacher had confidence in their skills; this was slightly less than was true of similar activities. The one HIC-M aide indicated that the teacher had confidence in her skills and she felt comfortable with the Title I teacher. She spent more than half of her time working directly with pupils and felt that she had been given enough responsibilities.

Inservice Training

An inservice was provided by the vendor in September for new teachers and for continuing teachers and aides. The inservice was designed to give staff an opportunity to review new materials. Inservice for HIC-R was rated average by HIC-R principals. The one principal who rated the HIC-M inservice called it ineffective. These ratings were below the average of all Title I ratings.

The frequency and type of inservices in HIC resembled those of other activities. Teachers in HIC-R rated inservice as good or very good; aides' ratings ranged from fair to very good. HIC-R teachers gave slightly lower ratings to on-site consultations. Seventy-seven percent of the HIC-R teachers felt that the inservice had improved their classroom instruction; this was slightly less than the 90 percent found in other activities. The HIC-M respondent reported that the inservice had not improved her classroom instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

The minimum space requirement for the activity was one separate full-sized classroom. Several 110-volt electrical outlets for audiovisual equipment were also required. All of the observed High Intensity Centers were located in full-sized classrooms that accommodated the materials adequately.

No problems were reported with materials, equipment, or supplies. For HIC-R materials and equipment were rated above average in effectiveness by principals. Vendor service received an average rating. With respect to HIC-M, the principal rated materials as very effective, equipment received an average rating, and vendor service received a rating of ineffective.

Eighty-five percent of the teachers felt that the instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for HIC-R; this was slightly less than the 95 percent found in other activities. Ratings for the quality of the instructional materials in this activity were also slightly lower than usual. Seventy-five percent of the teachers reported that Title I consumable supplies were received in adequate quantity which was less than the 89 percent observed in similar activities. Moreover, only 61 percent reported that they were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary with the instructional materials; 86 percent were able to do so in other laboratory activities. Nevertheless, even with the apparent lower ratings for instructional materials, more of the HIC-R teachers were involved in the selection of materials than was observed in similar activities. The one teacher response for HIC-M would indicate that the teacher was quite satisfied with the materials and supplies provided.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations within HIC-R revealed that the average number of pupils enrolled was 13 and the average number in attendance was 11. Ninety-eight percent of the pupils were found to be on task. The percentage of direct instructional interaction time with pupils was not unlike that of other activities.

Teachers confirmed that teacher aides spent the greatest proportion of their time assisting pupils individually with learning tasks and checking pupils' written work. Title I classes had been cancelled an average of 8 days which was not unlike that of other activities. The one respondent for HIC-M reported 10 days of Title I class cancellation during the school year. Sixty-eight percent of the teachers who were familiar with other Title I activities felt that HIC-R was comparatively very effective; this was lower than the 88 percent comparative rating for similar activities. The one HIC-M response would indicate that the activity was perceived to be comparatively very effective.

Pupil Response

HIC teachers reported that most of the students were actively and cooperatively interested. Non-Title I classroom teachers noted exceptional growth in service to school, personal responsibility, and academic effort on the part of those pupils attending HIC-R.

Principals rated HIC-R above average in terms of meeting its objectives, which placed it slightly higher than the average for all Title I activities. HIC-M was rated very effective.

Communication

Questionnaire results suggest that all of the teachers communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' progress. The communication generally took place informally on a weekly basis. Moreover, 94 percent of the non-Title I teachers said they shared information regularly with HIC teachers.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Ninety-four percent of the 17 HIC-R parents and all 19 of the HIC-M parents responding to questionnaires were aware that their children were participating in a Title I program. Eighty-eight percent of the HIC-R parents had visited their children's regular classrooms and 53 percent had visited their children's Title I classrooms. For HIC-M, 89 percent visited the regular classrooms and 53 percent visited the Title I classrooms. Most of the parents in both activities agreed that their children were using their free time in a more useful way than they had in the past; these ratings were higher than for similar activities. The percentage of parents who felt that their children had achieved more than they would have without the extra program was approximately the same for the two programs and both were consistent with the 77 percent found in other laboratory activities. All of the parents in each of the activities felt that the program ought to be continued.

HIC-R teachers reported minimal interest on the part of parents. For HIC-M, the majority of parents were considered interested but not active.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES*

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	58%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	74%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	11 mos.	Yes

*Vocabulary results are based on 813 pupils, reading comprehension on 820, and mathematics total on 65.

An inspection of Table 1 reveals that none of the achievement objectives was met by HIC-R. In terms of achievement as measured by the *Iowa Tests of Basic Skills* (ITBS), HIC-R appeared to be average for laboratory reading activities. HIC-R's three-year average gain was also not unlike that of other laboratory activities, i.e., seven months. The percent having a positive standard score gain in reading was consistent with Title I overall; however, the grade-equivalent gain was slightly lower, i.e., seven months versus eight months for Title I overall. The activity seems to have been most effective for the older students and least effective for the primary students. Younger pupils had difficulty in working on their individual tasks independently.

HIC-M produced better results. The percent of pupils having standard score gains in mathematics exceeded the overall Title I average, i.e., 74 percent versus 56 percent. The grade-equivalent gains in mathematics also exceeded the Title I average, i.e., 11 months versus 8 months. With respect to other laboratory mathematics activities, HIC-M had the highest one-year grade equivalent gain; the one-year standard score gain approached the top placement and the three-year gain was the highest.

Complete tabulations of the achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

HIC-R cost approximately $693,817 for 1,175 pupils. The cost per pupil was $590 and the cost per pupil hour of instruction was $5.34. The total cost for HIC-M was $73,810 for 125 pupils, with a cost per pupil of $590, and a cost per pupil hour of instruction equalling $5.06. The cost per pupil hour of instruction were up for both activities from what they had been in 1979; nevertheless, they remained average for laboratory activities.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

Implementation of the activity presented no major problems.

Non-Title I teachers noted exceptional growth in service to school, personal responsibility, and academic effort on the part of the HIC pupils.

Inservice was average for laboratory activities.

Individualization of instruction was more difficult in this activity than in other laboratory activities.

HIC appears to have been effective at maintaining a high degree of active learner involvement.

Parents noted that children were using their free time more usefully.

There was regular informal communication among staff regarding pupil progress.

Parents were aware of their children's participation in Title I and felt that the program ought to be continued.

Achievement results for reading indicate that the program was most effective at the upper and least effective at the lower age levels.

Achievement results for mathematics indicate that the program was extremely effective at the intermediate level; no data were available for the primary and upper age levels.

The per pupil cost was average for laboratory activities.

Recommendations

Limit the reading component to intermediate and upper age cycle students.

With respect to teachers, improve instructional materials in HIC-R in terms of quality, quantity, and appropriateness for individualization.

Improve the inservice component.

Review the appropriateness of materials for the lower age cycles. Lack of success at the lower levels might be caused by the materials.

HIC-R has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing the desired effects.

HIC-M has been assessed as one of the most effective mathematics activities.

Summary

While the Title I principals felt that HIC-R was above average in meeting objectives, the achievement results indicate that the achievement objectives were met in reading comprehension and vocabulary only at the upper level; the activity was not as effective at improving reading scores at the primary and intermediate levels.

HIC-M was very successful in the one school using it in fiscal 1980. Its achievement for the past three years have also been excellent.

1

R&E #82
Project #624
Program #7629
Evaluator: John Brunetti

MULTIMEDIA AUDIOVISUAL READINESS KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The MARK activity was to provide a learning structure to meet the reading readiness needs of identified Title I pupils from kindergarten through the third year of school beyond kindergarten. Groups of 10 or 15 pupils were to receive reading readiness and remedial reading instruction on a prescriptive basis for a minimum of 30 minutes daily.

Four public and one non-public school enrolled 375 kindergarten and primary pupils in MARK; the activity was staffed by six teachers and three aides. One of the four public schools purchased this program for only bilingual pupils. This was the second year of the MARK option in Chicago's Title I program.

Kits were to be provided to increase visual skills, auditory skills, and alphabet recognition. Materials were also available in Spanish. During each period some pupils were to be involved in the multimedia skill-building activities. These kits provided reading readiness and remedial reading instruction on a prescriptive basis which would individualize the pupil's progress and allow the pupil to progress at his own pace.

The vendor, Midwest Visual Equipment Company, was to provide a one-day joint inservice for teachers and aides prior to the activity implementation as well as continuing on-site inservice consultations dependent upon local needs.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Initiation of Instruction

MARK was implemented in October. Classroom teachers selected pupils for this activity based on their CP/ML reading levels. The assignment of two aides was delayed but this did not impede the initiation of instruction. All equipment from Bell and Howell was in the schools from the previous year.

Staffing

Some initial shuffling of personnel in three schools caused minor delays. However, all teachers and most aides were assigned in time for October implementation. A substitute teacher handled a long term teacher absence in one MARK unit in the spring which caused an interruption in the continuity of instruction. Most of the teachers were experienced with MARK as the majority of them had conducted this activity in fiscal 1979. The principals felt that their MARK teachers were excellent.

Inservice Training

The vendor provided a one-day joint inservice for teachers and aides prior to the implementation of this activity in fiscal 1980. Two of the surveyed teachers rated these vendor inservices and on-site consultations as good or excellent; one did not. Over two-thirds of these teachers felt that vendor inservice and on-site consultations helped them individualize instruction using the MARK materials, but indicated that these inservices didn't necessarily aid them in improving classroom instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Vendor materials were delivered in late September and early October 1979. A few of the teachers did not receive materials for all age levels but made exchanges with other MARK teachers for the appropriate materials. Principals rated the materials and equipment of this activity as average.

Efficiency of Operation

Observational data indicated that the instructional content of the classes was well organized. Individualization was evident. Program implementation was good. Many classroom teachers who had pupils in MARK responded to a questionnaire. Over 90 percent felt that the pupils benefited from MARK instruction and that this was an effective activity for the primary pupils. However, 56 percent of the responding teachers felt that pupils sometimes missed profitable homeroom instruction by attending this laboratory. This work had to be made up through special instruction and homework. Classroom teachers as well as the MARK teachers stated that MARK materials correlated with the board curriculum.

Pupil Response

Classroom teachers indicated that both personal responsibility and academic effort of the pupils had increased as a result of MARK instruction. Classroom observations found pupils on task and actively engaged with the instruction. Parents responding to a questionnaire (64%) felt their children used their free time in a more productive way as a result of participation in MARK.

Title I and Regular Staff Communication

Classroom and Title I teachers communicated with each other weekly on an informal basis regarding the progress of the MARK pupils.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The majority of the parents indicated that they were aware of their children's participation in Title I and had visited the activity classroom. All of the parents wanted this program to be continued. Parents as rated by the teachers were found interested in the activity (52 percent) but only one-quarter of them were active.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Achievement results for MARK have been low since its origination in Title I. It should be noted that only four schools purchased MARK in 1979 and 1980. Three of the four public schools tested pupils on either the ITBS or CTBS standardized achievement tests, the majority on CTBS. Only 12 pupils from one school had matched scores on the ITBS; this is understandable, since MARK was designed to serve needs of beginning readers and only age cycle eight had gain scores on the ITBS.

As can be seen in Table 1, the 12 pupils tested on ITBS made sufficient gains in vocabulary to meet the objective but not in reading comprehension.

Neither age cycle five nor six met the Title I objectives for reading comprehension on the CTBS. The objectives were that 45 percent of the kindergarten pupils and forty percent of the six-year-old pupils would exceed the fiftieth percentile in reading for these ages nationally. Only 14 percent of the kindergarten and 13 percent of the six-year-old pupils accomplished this in MARK. Mean scores for both ages were in the low to average range nationally.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=12)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest: - Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	72%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest: - Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	33%	No
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	2 mos.	No

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of MARK was $198,065 or about $528 per pupil. While per pupils costs of MARK were considered average for laboratory activities, the low achievement gains certainly indicate that this activity was not cost effective.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Only four public and one non-public school selected MARK in fiscal 1980. MARK materials correlated with the board curriculum. Achievement results on the ITBS and CTBS were low for the third consecutive year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the low achievement results as well as its unpopularity, this Title I activity has again been assessed as ineffective in meeting the needs of kindergarten and primary pupils in the Title I program and should be dropped from the Title I application.

R&E #97
Project #238
Program #7623
Evaluator: George Dalin

NEW CENTURY BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980, New Century Basic Skills (NCBS), a laboratory activity new to Chicago's Title I project, operated in three public schools. Overall, 280 pupils were served by three teachers and one aide. NCBS provided an individualized reading program for 80 or 120 pupils in the fourth through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. Groups of 16 or 24 pupils received 40 minutes of instruction daily.

The three teachers and one aide from the three participating schools engaged in a five-day training program prior to the implementation of the activity. A half-day inservice session was held during the school year. On-site inservice was provided to ensure proper implementation of the activity.

Pupil participants worked in a 16- or 24-station laboratory. Pupils took a series of individually prescribed self-administered placement and diagnostic tests. After the prescription was determined, pupils worked with the Verbal Skills Curriculum which offered 16 courses that provided a comprehensive system for the development of reading skills. Audiovisual equipment was also included in the NCBS package. An additional amount of $2.00 per pupil was provided for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

NCBS was selected by the three participating schools because of the activity's instructional emphasis and methods. Other reasons for selection were: the activity was effective in other cities and the available school space could accommodate the NCBS laboratory.

Initiation of Instruction

In two of the three participating schools selection of pupils was not completed by the target date of October 15, 1979. One principal reported that difficulties were encountered in selecting eligible pupils. Principals indicated that pupils were selected on the basis of their continuous progress levels, teacher recommendations, and standardized test scores. Pupils of age cycles 10 through 14 were placed in the activity. Class instruction was reported to have begun in one school before mid-October. In another school installation of the reading laboratory was not completed by the third week of October. Scheduling of pupils was a problem in the third school.

Pupils' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) were in preparation at the time of the fall interviews with the three principals. In the three schools the ILPs were to be prepared by the Title I teachers in consultation with the non-Title I teachers and the principals. Monitoring of ILPs was reportedly done by the principal, the district Title I reading coordinator, and/or the designated local school Title I coordinator.

Staffing

There was no shortage of qualified teachers or teacher aides to operate NCBS in the three schools. In one school, however, the NCBS teacher was transferred to another position at mid-year. This transfer required the principal to select another teacher from her staff.

Inservice Training

Inservice meetings conducted by the vendor were rated by activity teachers as very good. On-site vendor consultation was rated good or very good by the activity teachers. The district Title I coordinators' on-site consultations were rated as very good. Activity teachers believed that inservice meetings and on-site consultations improved their classroom instruction. Principals also believed that the activity inservices were effective for their staff.

The final vendor inservice meeting held in May 1980 assessed activity effectiveness. Positive and negative activity aspects were discussed by the staff and the vendor. The vendor was quite receptive to suggestions for activity improvement.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment and Materials

In each school observed, NCBS was operating in a separate classroom. In two of the three laboratories the physical environment was rated above average because of the organization of the activity materials and supplies.

Observations also revealed that two of three school sites were considered above average, i.e., in terms of school appearance and organization of the facilities.

Activity teachers felt that instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity, and they rated the quality of the instructional materials as excellent. Title I consumable supplies were received in adequate quantity in each school. The NCBS materials were reported by teachers as suitable for individualized instruction. Activity teachers felt that the NCBS materials were easy to correlate with Chicago CP/ML levels. Principals rated the materials as effective or very effective.

Classroom observations conducted during the first semester showed that all pupils were either working with a learning kit, programmed text, or writing material. The second semester observations revealed that all pupils were working with activity materials.

Efficiency of Operation

The activity teachers, during classroom observations, were rated average or above average in giving clear and organized instruction relevant to the activity format. These teachers also presented challenging lessons which were adapted to pupils' levels. Each learning environment was rated above average because class routines were established and pupils were attending to their assigned tasks. All pupils were observed working on various activity tasks. The teachers, therefore, were effective in establishing the NCBS laboratory format.

Pupil Response

Generally, pupils were allowed to express their opinions on their assigned reading tasks. New Century teachers rated the majority of the pupils (85 percent) as actively and cooperatively interested in the laboratory activities. Only ten percent of the pupils were interested but not active in laboratory tasks. Five percent were not noticeably interested in performing tasks. However, one teacher indicated that pupils who were three to four years below level in reading did not respond when the teacher required them to complete a unit every two weeks.

Title I and Regular Staff Communication

Communication between the NCBS teachers and the board-funded teachers of these pupils was done on a regular basis. Informal meetings were used to update pupils' ILPs. Pupils' skill achievement in the laboratory was shared frequently with the board-funded teachers. The School Community Representatives (SCRs) were also consulted by the NCBS teachers. Reports of the pupils' progress were also transmitted to the pupils' homes by the SCRs.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Seventy-two percent of the surveyed parents knew that their children were participating in the activity. More than 80 percent had visited their child's regular classroom or teacher. Slightly more than half of the parents had visited their children's Title I classroom or teacher.

Pupils and their parents appeared to have cooperated on homework assignments. Parents reported that they assisted their children daily or weekly. A majority of parents believed that their children used their free time more constructively than the previous school year. The available evaluation data seem to indicate that pupil participants' attitudes about the activity were positive.

The two parent objectives, awareness of the child's participation and visiting the child's classroom or teacher, were not met. However, parents of children in the upper age cycles generally have not participated in school activities to the same extent as parents of younger pupils. Parents, did request information on their children's reading progress in NCBS. In response, the NCBS vendor prepared a letter reporting pupils' skill achievements which was sent by the teacher to parents.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 gives the ITBS results. All age cycles exceeded the reading comprehension objectives. The distribution of the mean gain scores in reading comprehension for the three schools ranged from nine months to 2.2 years. It should be noted that upper age cycle pupils in Title I usually demonstrated greater grade equivalent gains than lower age cycle pupils. The mean standard score for reading comprehension was 238 on the pretest and 245 on the posttest. These scores correspond to the 29th and 40th percentile respectively on the distribution of all ITBS scores citywide. When compared with Title I results overall the NCBS pupils demonstrated a greater percentile rank improvement than did other Title I pupils.

TABLE 1. ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=259)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	61%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent of with Standard Scores gains	60%	75%	Yes
-Mean grade equivalent gain	8 mos.	14 mos.	Yes

What is remarkable for this first year Title I reading laboratory is that it ranked first in reading achievement gain of all Title I reading activities. On the average, pupil participants demonstrated a 1.4 grade-equivalent year gain in reading comprehension. The average grade-equivalent gain for two of the three schools was 0.9 years. For the third school it was 2.2 grade-equivalent years. This school also showed unusually large standard score gains.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated cost per pupil for NCBS was $541. The estimated cost per pupil instructional hour was $4.64. The activity's per pupil hour cost ranked the third lowest of the 11 Title I reading laboratory activities. Although NCBS operated in three schools, it appeared to be a productive activity for intermediate and upper age cycle pupils. Despite the transfer of a teacher in one school, the activity still showed above average reading gains in all three schools.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The New Century Basic Skills activity demonstrated excellent pupil reading achievement gains. As a laboratory approach to reading, it was accepted by the majority of pupils. But some pupils who were three to four years below reading level could not maintain the prescribed pace of a new unit every two weeks. Generally, New Century teachers adapted well to the activity format which was correlated with the CP/ML levels. Parents who were aware of the activity seemed satisfied with their children's progress. Principals were satisfied with the activity. However, a delay of full implementation caused two principals some concern at the beginning of the school year. Overall, the activity seemed effective in increasing pupils' reading skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Installation of the New Century laboratory materials and equipment should be completed by the first week of school.

Title I schools in need of an upper age cycle reading laboratory approach should consider the New Century Basic Skills activity.

Pupils who are selected for this activity should be capable of completing the activity units at the prescribed pace.

R&E #33
Project #599
Program #7633
Evaluator: George Dalin

TEACHING READING SKILLS THROUGH DRAMA

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Teaching Reading Skills Through Drama (DRAMA), in its seventh year as a Chicago Title I activity in fiscal 1980, served either 55 or 75 pupils in the fourth through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. Pupils received a minimum of 225 minutes of instruction weekly.

Twelve public schools purchased the activity to serve a total of 780 pupils. There were 12 teachers and six aides assigned. Teachers were selected on the basis of special training in reading and of some knowledge in drama. The ESEA Title I coordinators were responsible for giving citywide and local school inservice and technical assistance.

The activity materials provided a balanced view of the contributions of different ethnic groups in American society. These materials included illustrations of scenes, situations, and persons which could be esily identified and had a motivational effect on the pupils. Activty materials cost $37 or $47 per pupil depending on the option. An addicional amount of $4.50 per pupil was provided for supplies.

In addition to improving their reading skills, pupils created roles in the dramatization of a subject already in the activity classroom.

Parents were involved in all aspects of the program by assisting, when possible, in the costuming, staging, production of plays and assemblies, and by helping pupils read and memorize their parts in the plays. Parents also accompanied pupils on field trips and attended school programs and activity-related meetings.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Seventy-five percent of the principals selecting the DRAMA activity did so because of its instructional emphasis and

and methods. Half of the principals indicated that the activity had been effective at their schools in previous years. A third of the principals stated that they selected the activity because of the talents of their teachers.

Initiation of Instruction

Principals along with their staff selected intermediate and upper age cycle pupils on the basis of continuous progress placement. These pupil participants were at least one and one-half years behind in reading achievement. Some principals indicated that they selected pupils who were not only in need of supplemental reading instruction, but who were also in need of an activity that would allow them to express themselves creatively. A majority of the interviewed principals reported that activity instruction began before the middle of October. During the fall only two principals were concerned about the late delivery of board suppies but this did not prevent instruction from occurring. When asked who prepared pupils' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs), the principals' responses fell into three teacher groups: IRIP teachers, non-Title I teachers, and Title I teachers. The principals reported that they were planning to monitor ILPs with another staff member. It should be noted that ILP preparation was still in progress of the time of the principal interviews. Finally, the fall observations of activity classes showed that all observed classes were adequately implemented.

Staffing

More than 90 percent of the principals indicatd that there was no shortage of qualified teachers and teacher aides for the DRAMA activity. Only one principal was dissatisfied with the DRAMA teacher assigned.

Inservice

A majority of the teacher respondents rated vendor inservice training meetings as good or very good. The teachers attended an average of three District Title I meetings. These meetings were rated as good or very good by all the teacher respondents. All of the teachers felt that the inservice meetings improved classroom instruction. Although the DRAMA staff considered inservice sessions beneficial, observations revealed that very little time was spent on activity material use and teaching techniques. More time on these components was needed for the staff. A sample of teacher aides' ratings about inservice training revealed that vendor and district Title I meetings were considered beneficial. Principals' ratings of inservice meetings showed that they felt vendor inservice was average or above average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In each school observed the DRAMA activity was operating in an unshared classroom. Ninety percent of these classrooms were standard sized classrooms.

During a second round of classroom observations, 60 percent of the classrooms were rated above average, i.e. current student work was on display and the physical condition of the classroom was good. The other classrooms were rated average by the Title I field evaluators. Sixty percent of the school facilities in which the activity units operated were rated above average and forty percent were rated average.

Instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for all levels. A majority of the activity teachers (88%) rated the quality of instruction materials as excellent and 12 percent rated DRAMA materials as good. All of the activity teachers reported that Title I consumable supplies were available in adequate quantity. In addition, all activity teachers were able to individualize instruction with the DRAMA materials. But the use of activity materials was still a problem. DRAMA teachers needed to institute playwriting activities for their pupils. In addition, some schools did not allow pupils to take materials out of the activity classroom.

Classroom observations revealed that 43 percent of the pupils were working with instructional source materials and almost 40 percent of the observed pupils were not. However, 87 percent of the pupils were observed working on assigned tasks. Many of these pupils were rehearsing a play.

Efficiency of Operation

Activity teachers were observed to be average (60%) or above average (40%) in giving clear and organized instruction relevant to the activity format. Half of the observed DRAMA treachers were rated average in adapting lessons to their pupils' ability level and half were rated above average. However, all of the observed DRAMA teachers were rated average in displaying fairness and friendliness with their pupils. The teacher aides were observed as assisting their teachers in marking papers, instructing small groups, and tutoring.

The learning environment in 60 percent of the observed DRAMA classes was rated above average, i.e., class routine was established, pupils were self-controlled, and minimum time was lost. The other 40 percent were rated average in these categories. Additional assistance from Title I district coordinators was needed for those DRAMA teachers who were rated average in classroom management.

During the first semester, classroom observations revealed that 86 percent of the pupils were working on assigned tasks. The second semester classroom observations showed that all pupils were working on assigned tasks. Pupils were allowed to express their opinions freely in a majority of the observed DRAMA classes.

Pupil Responses

Activity teachers rated a majority of their pupils (78%) as actively and cooperatively interested in the DRAMA activity. Sixteen percent of their pupils were interested but not active in the activity. Non-Title I teachers, however, did not see that the DRAMA activity changed many of their pupils' attitudes toward school, self, and school work. Only 20 percent of these teachers recorded an increase in their pupils' service to school. A third saw an increase in pupils' personal responsibility. Approximately 60 percent thought the DRAMA activity helped pupils' academic effort. The pupil attitude objectives were therefore partially met.

Title I and Regular Staff Communication

DRAMA teachers reported that they communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about pupils' progress. Usually this was done weekly and informally. Although communication seemed to be on a regular basis, 23 percent of the non-Title I teachers reported that their pupils missed necessary homeroom class instruction. In most cases the Title I teacher shared responsibility with the non-Title I teachers on ILP maintenance. More than 80 percent of the DRAMA teachers were aware of their pupils' home situation via the School Community Representatives' involvement.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Only 81 percent of the sampled parents were aware that their children participated in the DRAMA activity, thus failing to achieve the goal of 90 percent. However, more than 65 percent of the sampled parents did visit their child's teacher or classroom. The goal was that 60 percent of the parents would visit; therefore, the DRAMA activity met this goal. Furthermore, the surveyed parents reported that they did work more with their children in fiscal 1980 than they had previously. More than half of the sampled parents indicated that they assisted their children with homework daily or weekly. Sixty-two percent of the respondents felt that the DRAMA activity was instrumental in increasing their children's achievement.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The overall achievement gains for the DRAMA activity are reported in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=609)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	54%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	55%	Yo
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	Yes

The percent of pupils, age 9 and above, having a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension on the ITBS ranged from 36 percent to 70 percent. Age cycle 13 and 14 pupils met the goal of 60 percent. Age cycle 10, 13, and 14 pupils achieved a grade-equivalent gain of eight months in reading comprehension which was the stated goal for all participating age cycles. However, only age cycle 9 pupils achieved the objective which required that at least 60 percent achieve a standard score gain in vocabulary on the ITBS.

The distribution of school mean gains in reading comprehension ranged from 4 months to 10 months. The percent of pupils having positive standard score gains in reading comprehension ranged from 44 percent to 68 percent in the participating schools. Only three schools achieved the goal that at least 60 percent of the pupils would have standard score gains in reading comprehension.

Pupils enrolled in DRAMA had higher pretest standard scores than was average for Title I pupils in reading comprehension.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The activity's estimated cost per pupil hour of $4.01 ranked second lowest of all the pull-out reading activities. The total cost was $411,325 or about $527 per pupil. Achievement results were average for Title I pull-out activities and slightly below average for all reading activities. This suggests that DRAMA was about average in cost-effectiveness.

Over the years, principals selected the DRAMA activity because most of their Title I pupils did not do well in other Title I activities. The DRAMA activity offered something more than drill in basic reading skills. What principals found was that the activity seemed to appeal to pupils at the intermediate and upper age cycles. These pup]ils needed different reading materials and the DRAMA activity offered high interest materials. Activity teachers renewed pupils' interest in reading by getting pupils to participate in performing activity plays. With the performing component, many pupils seemed to learn more about the nuances of natural language. Therefore, the short term benefits were to renew pupil interest in reading and the long term benefits were to increase pupils' reading achievement scores.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

The DRAMA activity seemed to have a generally positive impact on a majority of the pupil participants. Reading comprehension achievement gains were slightly above average when compared to overall Title I results in terms of grade-equivalent gains but somewhat below average in terms of standard score gains. Attitude measures, however, revealed that many pupils did not demonstrate positive attitude changes toward service to school and personal responsibility.

Principals and activity staff were generally in agreement that the DRAMA activity was beneficial for intermediate and upper age cycle pupils. However, a sizeable minority of the DRAMA pupils were missing necessary homeroom class instruction.

Classroom visits revealed that many pupils were responding to the activity format. Classroom environments varied in organization, yet the demeanor of the typical teacher was above average. Additional assistance on classroom management from district Title I reading coordinators was needed for some of the DRAMA teachers.

Activity materials were high interest plays. Supplementary workbooks were adequate for teaching many of the CP/ML reading skills. However, pupils in many of the units were not allowed to take drama materials out of the classroom. Inservice meetings for staff were slightly above average when compared to other Title I inservice meetings. However, very little inservice time was spent on the proper use of activity materials and teaching techniques.

The effectiveness, then, of this activity should be measured not by reading achievement gains only, but also by the apparent motivation of many pupils who were in need of a creative approach to learning reading skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

District Title I reading coordinators and activity staff should confer on methods to increase pupil participation and, in some schools, to improve classroom management.

Activity staff should consider implementing playwriting activities for their pupils.

Pupils should be allowed to use activity materials outside the activity classroom.

A citywide Title I Drama Festival should be considered so that pupils could develop a positive view of themselves and their home schools.

DRAMA pupils should receive the necessary classroom instruction which they miss while in the Title I activity.

This Title I activity has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of pupils in need of a motivational component and is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing the desired effects.

R&E #91
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: George Dalin

AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO CORRECTIVE AND REMEDIAL READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

An Eclectic Approach to Corrective and Remedial Reading (EC), one of the options in the Developing Reading Skills and Abilities umbrella activity, was in its eleventh year of operation in the Chicago Title I project in fiscal 1980. More than 80 public and 40 nonpublic schools selected this activity to serve 5,791 pupils.

This reading activity allowed the local school staff to design a supplementary reading program that would meet the needs of 18, 35, or 50 Title I pupils in the first through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. Pupils at the primary level were to receive instruction for 30 minutes daily; pupils at the intermediate and upper levels received instruction for 40 minutes daily.

ESEA Title I coordinators were to provide inservice meetings and workshops based on expressed or observed needs and on the requirement that provisions be made for the professional growth and development of staff.

Title I was to provide $19 per pupil for the purchase of instructional materials, tapes, and manipulatives, all of which could be selected from the approved list of instructional materials. An additional amount of $4.50 per pupil was provided for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Sixty-six percent of the principals interviewed selected the Eclectic activity because of its instructional emphasis and methods. Approximately half of the principals (48 percent) indicated that the activity had been effective at their school in previous years. A fourth of the principals stated that they selected the activity because of the talents of their teachers who were able to develop a supplementary reading activity to meet their pupils needs.

Initiation of Instruction

Principals along with their staff selected primary, intermediate, and/or upper level pupils on the basis of their continuous progress placements. Previous Title I placement, diagnostic test results, 1978 ITBS scores, and teacher recommendations were also considered in pupil selection. A majority of the interviewed principals reported that the selection of pupils did not present any major problems.

Instruction started before mid-October in most of the EC schools. Various problems existed in some schools regarding the start of instruction. There was a shortage of teachers and teacher aides in a few schools. Also some principals reported that the selection of eligible pupils was still in process by mid-October.

When asked who prepared pupils' Individual Learning Plans (ILPs), principals indicated that non-Title I teachers prepared ILPs with the Eclectic teachers. In some schools IRIP teachers were to assist the Title I teachers on ILP preparation and maintenance. Monitoring of ILPs generally was done by the principal and another staff member.

Staffing

A majority of the interviewed principals (89 percent) indicated that there was no shortage of teachers and teacher aides for the Eclectic activity. Many of the surveyed principals rated their Eclectic staff as above average in operating this pull-out reading activity.

Inservice

Inservice meetings for fiscal 1980 focused on rules and regulations of Title I, ILP preparation, materials, supplies and equipment, parent involvement, and teacher preparation of supplementary reading material. Most of the Eclectic teachers (93 percent) rated inservice meetings as good or very good. About the same percent felt that on-site consultations by district Title I coordinators was good or very good. A little more than 80 percent believed that Eclectic inservice meetings improved their classroom instruction. Teacher aides also believed that activity inservice meetings were effective, and they rated on-site consultations by district Title I staff as good or very good. Most principals rated Eclectic inservice meetings as above average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In 75 percent of the schools, the Eclectic activity operated in unshared classrooms. The remaining 25 percent of the observed classes were in shared classrooms. Some 25 percent of the classes took place in a small room, a hallway, or in an assembly hall. The physical atmosphere in 55 percent of the observed Eclectic classrooms was rated above average. Pupils' work was on display. Bulletin boards in many of these classrooms illustrated supplementary reading skills for pupils' use. About 20 percent of the activity classrooms, however, were rated below average, i.e., pupils' current work was not on display and/or bulletin boards were not used. Approximately 50 percent of the schools in which the activity operated were rated above average, and nearly 40 percent were rated average.

Instructional materials in most of the participating schools were provided in adequate quantity for all levels. Ninety-three percent of the surveyed Eclectic teachers rated the quality of instructional materials as excellent or good. A majority of these teachers (91 percent) received consumable supplies in adequate quantity. Eighty percent were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary. Twenty percent could barely individualize instruction with the materials available.

More than 70 percent of the teachers indicated that they were involved to a great extent in the selection of reading materials. However, 27 percent reported that they had little or no involvement in the selection of materials. About 80 percent of the teachers claimed that the correlation of EC materials with Chicago CP/ML levels was moderately easy or very easy. Nineteen percent, however, reported that materials correlation was moderately difficult.

Classroom observations revealed that a little more than half of the pupils were working with instructional source material, and a little less than half not. A majority of the observed pupils (95 percent) were working on assigned tasks or waiting for assignments.

Efficiency of Operation

Activity teachers were observed to be average (37 percent) or above average (33 percent) in giving clear and organized instruction relevant to the activity format. More than 70 percent of the observed teachers were rated above average in adapting lessons to their pupils' ability levels, and they also gave assignments and directions in a clear and definite manner. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers were rated above average in displaying fairness and friendliness with their pupils. The learning environment in approximately 70 percent of the Eclectic classes was rated above average, i.e. class routine was established, pupils were self-controlled, and minimum time was lost.

Activity teacher aides were observed doing various activities to assist the teachers and pupils. Many of the teacher aides were observed recordkeeping, supervising, and/or tutoring a small group or an individual.

Classroom observations showed that a majority of the pupils (95 percent) were working on an activity task. In 40 percent of the observed classrooms, teachers gave individualized instruction to many of their pupils. In 45 percent of the observed classrooms pupils were allowed to express their opinions freely on activity work. A majority of the teachers (75 percent) were observed to be pupil oriented in their instruction.

Pupil Responses

EC teachers rated a majority of their pupils (78 percent) as actively and cooperatively interested in the Eclectic activity. Eleven percent of their pupils were interested but not active. The remaining pupils were not noticeably interested or noticeably uncooperative.

Only 39 percent of the non-Title I teachers with pupils in the activity reported that their pupils increased their service to school, but 56 percent said that their pupils demonstrated an increase in personal reponsibility. More than 70 percent of the respondents indicated that their pupils showed an increase in academic effort as a result of their participation in the activity.

Title I and Regular Staff Communications

A majority of the surveyed Eclectic teachers (96 percent) communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils. More than half of the teachers (55 percent) met weekly with the non-Title I teachers, 28 percent met daily with non-Title I staff, and 17 percent met monthly. Eighty-seven percent of the surveyed non-Title I staff reported that Eclectic teachers shared reading skill progress information on their pupils. A little more than half of the non-Title I teachers claimed that they were given an inservice on the format of the Eclectic activity. Maintenance of the ILPs was done by a variety of school personnel. Usually the Eclectic reading teacher conferred with the non-Title I teachers with pupils in the activity. In some schools, the principal assigned the IRIP teacher to maintain pupils' ILPs.

A little more than 60 percent of the Eclectic activity teachers were made more aware of their pupils' home situations by conferring with the School-Community Representatives (SCRs). Half of the Eclectic teachers felt that the SCRs' home visits made them more aware of their pupils' instructional needs. The remaining activity teachers were not sure or were not aware of pupils' instructional needs.

Parent Involvement

Ninety percent of the surveyed parents reported that they were aware that their children participated in the Eclectic activity. All of these parents had visited their children's regular classrooms or teachers, but only 40 percent visited their children's Eclectic classrooms or teachers. These surveyed parents also indicated that they assisted their children with school work more than they had previously. Seventy-five percent assisted their children with their homework daily or weekly. A majority of parents (70 percent) rated the Eclectic activity as excellent or good, and the same percent believed their children achieved more academically because of the Eclectic activity. This reflects a sizeable percentage of parents who felt the activity to be fair or poor. However, 90 percent felt that the activity should be continued.

Participant Achievement

The ITBS achievement results for the Eclectic activity are reported in Table 1. More detailed tables appear in Volume 2 of this report.

Age cycle 12, 13, and 14 pupils met the goal of at least 60 percent having a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension. At least 50 percent of age cycle 8, 9, 10, and 11 pupils had a positive gain score in reading comprehension. Only 36 percent of the age cycle 7 pupils demonstrated a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension. Sixty-five percent of the age cycle 14 pupils had a positive standard score gain in vocabulary. Less than 60 percent of the age cycle 7 through 13 pupils had a positive standard score gain in vocabulary. But pupils at age cycles 7, 12, 13, and 14 were able to achieve at least an eight month grade-equivalent gain in vocabulary. The average vocabulary gain for age cycle 9, 10, and 11 pupils was a meager five months.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=4,618)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest: -Percent with Standard Score gains	60	55%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest: -Percent with Standard Score gains	60	58%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No

It is interesting to notice that the distribution of individual school mean gains in reading comprehension ranged from two months to eighteen months. The range of standard score gains in reading comprehensioin was from 33 percent to 92 percent. Less than half of the reporting schools (44 percent) had their pupils gain eight or more months in reading comprehension, and only 39 percent of the participating schools had at least 60 percent of their pupils demonstrate a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension.

Finally, the CTBS results revealed that 31 percent of the age cycle 6 pupils exceeded the fiftieth percentile in reading. Although these results were below the objective of 40 percent, it was average for Title I.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated cost per pupil instructional hour was $7.54. This cost was about average for the pull-out activities. Although pupil reading achievement and attitude results were slightly below average for pull-out activities, some principals and their staff believed that the Eclectic activity was better than many of the other pull-out activities available. Reasons for this belief were that the Eclectic activity cost less (in terms of the unit costs used to compute costs to the schools) when compared to the unit cost of pull-out activities and reading laboratories, and each school could select its own materials and use various teaching techniques. In addition, principals felt that by selecting experienced staff there would be long range academic benefits for many of their pupils. For those schools with excellent reading achievement and attitude results, the principals' perceptions were probably accurate; however, these perceptions point to the fact that the success of an activity emerges as much from the schools and teachers, as from a given instructional approach.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Many principals believed that the Eclectic activity was above average in meeting its objectives. Furthermore, they rated staff and vendor service as above average. Activity teachers also believed that the Eclectic format was above average. Parents indicated that their children seemed to benefit from this activity.

Pupil responses to the Eclectic Approach to Reading were good. Their classroom behavior revealed that most were attending to assigned tasks. Their attitude changes, however, depended partially upon the Eclectic classroom environment.

Overall, the Eclectic activity's reading achievement results were slightly below average. But part of these results showed that pupils at the upper age cycles achieved more in reading comprehension than pupils at the lower age cycles. However, this was true of Title I generally. Upper age cycle pupils also demonstrated greater gains in vocabulary. In addition, there was a considerable range of pupil achievement results among schools. Less than half of the schools were able to meet the achievement goals.

The following recommendations are offered:

> Principals and their Eclectic staff should confer on the selection of appropriate reading material for their pupils.
>
> Additional communication between School-Community Representatives and Eclectic staff should be considered so that more information on pupils can be shared and used to improve instruction.
>
> Since there were many schools which did not meet the reading achievement objectives, district Title I staff should confer with school staff on organizing an effective instruction format.
>
> This Title I activity has been assessed as being capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils in some schools and is recommended for continuation if competent and experienced reading teachers can be assigned to it.

R&E #85
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: John Brunetti

BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES/SULLIVAN READING PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal year 1980 the Behavioral Research Laboratories/ Sullivan Reading Program (BRL) activity was implemented in two public and one nonpublic school as an option of the umbrella project, Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. Three teachers and three teacher aides were to serve approximately 150 pupils. This was the ninth year of operation for this activity.

This activity provided the opportunity for the local school staff to structure a supplementary program in reading to meet the needs, for 40 minutes daily, of Title I pupils in the first through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten.

The vendor package offered a wide range of remedial, corrective, and developmental reading instruction, including diagnostic-prescriptive procedures, priorities of sequence, and the various levels of comprehension skills. There were specially developed materials for instruction in reading, listening, writing, and speaking. The reading materials included practice books, readers, and diagnostic and prescriptive components.

BRL was to provide a three-hour workshop prior to implementation and two others during the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In fiscal 1980, interviews with principals revealed that BRL was selected because it was uniquely different from the usual basal reading programs found in regular classes. Two of the principals said that the school selected the activity because it was cost effective. Budgeted costs of the activity were moderate and these principals mentioned that they could and did purchase this activity because of its low cost. They also emphasized that they thought that the activity's instructional methods best supplemented the needs of pupils of their school. These same principals said that they chose the activity because it had been effective in meeting particular needs in other schools.

One principal, in choosing BRL for primary pupils, stated that the activity's instruction program was well structured phonetically and "hence, ideal for the youngest pupils." On the other hand, an upper grade center purchased the activity because the activity could serve pupils in the first through sixth years of school and the teachers wanted a program highly effective in developing phonetic skills for the children of these ages who were very slow.

Implementation

Instruction began promptly in two schools in September, 1979. The third school had some problems with reorganization and pupil selection, so classes began in October. At one point during the year one teacher was replaced for several weeks and then returned. Instructional continuity was not affected, according to the principal.

Vendor inservice was not provided until mid-October. Even then, a teacher who was newly selected to teach the activity could not attend. Inservice was provided for this teacher later in the year. The two teachers who responded to the questionnaire indicated that the inservice was poor and did not help them in the classroom.

Although instruction began in the fall, all materials and supplies were not delivered on time by the vendor. Vendor service was erratic because of problems internal to the vending company. Local district Title I coordinators provided some inservices for the teachers to partially compensate for the loss of professional vendor inservice.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Two full-size regular classrooms were used for BRL in the public schools. In the non-public school classes were held in crowded makeshift space.

The schools which served primary and intermediate level pupils apparently had sufficient materials and, according to principals and teachers, were adequate for meeting pupil needs. A teacher of upper level pupils, however, found some of the materials to be inappropriate for these age levels and so used many supplementary materials together with the BRL materials, thus creating an eclectic type of approach.

All teachers indicated that the materials were difficult to correlate with Chicago CP/ML levels. Communication with the classroom teachers concerning each pupil's progress was regular and informal. Almost all pupils were judged by the teachers to be actively interested in learning. Parents were generally judged to be interested, with only a few actively participating.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Seventy-five percent of the parents responding to a questionnaire said they had worked more with their child in fiscal 1980 than during the previous year. Eighty-two percent reported that the activity helped their child achieve more than if there had been no Title I involve-ment. All parents felt the program should be continued; however, when asked to rate the activity, only two parents felt it was excellent and a quarter of the parents rated it "fair."

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupils in age cycle six were tested in reading using the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. They achieved a mean standard score in the average range and 39 percent scored above the national mean. Pupils in age cycle seven and above were tested using the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. These pupils averaged eight month gains, which was the objective, but only 56 percent had standard score gains, thus not meeting the 60 percent objective.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total cost of the activity was $114,623. Per pupil cost was $764. It must be noted that all materials and services were not delivered. The vending company experienced bankruptcy during fiscal 1980.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

BRL was not completely implemented in all schools, but teachers functioned quite well and indicated a desire to continue in the activity. Because of bankruptcy of the vendor, the activity will not be retained as part of Chicago's Title I project.

R&E #86
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

SCOTT, FORESMAN READING SYSTEM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Scott, Foresman Reading System (SCOTT) in its ninth year of operation in fiscal 1980 provided for individualized and small group instruction using a multimedia approach. This basal reading system, based on phonetic principles, provided 27 different reading instruction levels.

Schools purchasing the activity had to provide space for classes of 8 to 12 pupils. Materials were to be ordered from Scott, Foresman Reading Systems at a fee of $24 per pupil. SCOTT was to provide a three-hour workshop prior to implementa-tion as well as two additional three-hour workshops during the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

In fiscal 1980, two SCOTT units each with one teacher and one aide were purchased by one public and one nonpublic school to serve 30 primary and 120 intermediate level pupils. The schools purchased SCOTT because they felt the activity would best fit the needs of Title I pupils. In one school, activity classes apparently began by the 15th of September. In the other school, initiation of instruction seemed to have been delayed because the teacher and aide were assigned late.

In order to facilitate operation of the SCOTT activity and to enhance its effectiveness, the activity vendor provided workshops for the teachers. One teacher reported attending three of these meetings. Of the three meetings, one was considered to have been a good meeting and the other two were from poor to fair in quality. This viewpoint appears to have been supported by one of the two principals who completed the Principals' Evaluation Form for Title I activities. According to the principal, the inservices provided for the teachers were, at best, average in quality.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

A total of three visits were made by evaluators to obtain a comprehensive and detailed picture of the prevailing classroom environment in the SCOTT activity. In one school the activity was housed in a regular classroom. In the other school, the facility used was also a regular classroom except the teacher shared that room with another teacher. In either case, pupils' tasks centered primarily on seat or desk work, silent reading, listening and watching, in that order. To a lesser extent the pupils were also engaged in recitation exercises.

The materials used by 63 percent of the pupils were observed to be workbooks/or worksheets. The other 37 percent had no materials; they were engaged in listening or watching activities at the time of the observations. This finding is probably a reflection of logistic problems experienced by the school system and which resulted in late or no delivery of prescribed materials.

Teachers in this activity appear to have used, primarily, the individual pupil to teacher technique in much of their teaching. To a lesser extent the whole class lecture method was also employed. One fourth of the time appears to have been devoted to independent pupil activities during which time the teacher's task became one of supervising the pupils. The teacher aide was observed to be assisting the teacher in all tasks, including instructing pupils and supervising. The teacher aide also had the responsibility for marking papers and escorting pupils between the Title I room and the regular classroom. Thus, the predominant instruction mode in this activity appears to have focused on giving individual attention to the pupils.

The attitude of teachers appears to have been characterized by enthusiasm. In no less than 37 percent of the observation time the teachers were observed to be making positive remarks or giving clues to the pupils. This high degree of enthusiasm on the part of the teachers was not typical of some other Title I activities. Pupils appear to have responded positively to the teachers' manner of teaching. Evaluators noted, in all three visits, that all pupils were engaged in tasks and none were seen to be off the assigned learning tasks.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

A Parent Questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of parents of Title I pupils to measure the extent of their involvement in Title I activities. Of those who returned the questionnaires, two responded to the items dealing with SCOTT. One of these parents indicated awareness of the child's participation in the activity. Further, the parent had visited both the Title I and the regular classes which the child attended. In addition, this parent offered help to the child at home with school work and felt the child had achieved more in school than in previous years. This same parent suggested that the activity be continued in the future.

From the teachers' point of view, it seems that most parents did not appear to be interested and involved in Scott. One of the two teachers in the activity felt that as many as 70 percent of parents whose children participated in the SCOTT activity were neither active nor interested. Among the remainder, 15 percent were active and an equal proportion seemed interested but did not take an active part.

The picture was different with respect to pupils. Eighty-five percent were said to be interested and active; ten percent were believed to be just interested. Among the pupils, the proportion of those who were either inactive or uninterested was placed at five percent.

The evidence presented on the question of parental involvement does seem to suggest that neither of the two parent involvement objectives specified in Reading Top Priority was successfully attained. In view of the fact that only two schools participated in the activity and only one reported process information, the conclusion to be drawn with respect to the SCOTT activity is limited. The reason for the low rate of parental involvement could be a reflection of the local school situation, rather than the activity itself. Given another place and another time, the picture might be different.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The goal of the SCOTT activity was to improve the pupils' competency in reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge by at least eight months. The evaluation objective specified that 60 percent of the pupils would achieve a standard score gain. Tables 1 and 2 provide information on the extent to which the activity was effective in meeting Title I reading objectives. The tables provide information on pupils who were tested on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. The number of pupils shown in the table represent only those pupils for whom it was possible to match pretest scores with posttest scores and are for the public schools only. For each age cycle, the number of pupils with matched scores as shown in each table represents no less than 91 percent and up to 100 percent of the pupils whose posttest results were reported. An asterisk following an entry indicates the objective was met.

TABLE 1. ITBS READING COMPREHENSION GAINS

Age Level	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score Gains	Grade-Equivalent Gain
9	28	233	236	61*	6
10	33	237	241	70*	8*
11	31	229	234	77*	9*

Complete tabulations of the achievement data and explanations of the statistical terms used will be found in Volume 2.

Table 1 indicates the achievement of the pupils in reading comprehension. As the table shows, all three age cycles improved their position from the pretest to the posttest distributions. All these age cycles appear to have met the standard score objective. In terms of grade equivalents, the gains attained were six months for the nine-year-olds, eight months for the ten-year-olds and nine months for the eleven-year-olds. These figures indicate the eight months gain objective was attained by the ten- and the eleven-year-olds. The nine-year-olds did not do so well.

Table 2 indicates the gains in vocabulary knowledge of the pupils in the activity. The table suggests that only the ten-year-olds profited significantly from participation in the activity. In terms of grade equivalents, this age cycle's net gain in vocabulary knowledge was 9 months. Thus, both the 60 percent standard score objective and the eight months expectancy level were successfully attained by the ten-year-olds.

For age cycles 9 and 10, the picture is not so encouraging. Both groups appear to have maintained a position close to their pretest standing in the posttest distribution. Among these pupils, the proportions of those attaining standard-score gains fell short of expectations and each group's mean grade-equivalent gain failed to meet the eight months criteria.

TABLE 2. ITBS VOCABULARY GAINS

Age Level	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score Gains	Grade-Equivalent Gain
9	28	235	237	57	6
10	34	240	245	62*	9*
11	31	235	235	52	4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SCOTT has not been a popular choice with schools so far. In fiscal 1980, only two schools selected the activity. A total of two teachers, two teacher aides, and approximately 120 pupils comprised the entire activity.

Over the years the effectiveness of the activity has been considered to be above the average Title I activity. This conclusion is limited, however, since, in the past, schools have tended to enroll in the activity Title I pupils who were above average in the first place. Nevertheless, these pupils have generally done well. In fiscal 1980, over 60 percent of the entire activity's enrollment appears to have attained standard score gains in reading comprehension, but they were well below-average for Title I. Over 50 percent of all pupils achieved a similar status in vocabulary knowledge.

At this time, these results cannot be attributed entirely to the activity's methodology or management system in view of the fact that only two teachers were involved. Rather, the picture shown may be the result of the effects of the interaction between the two activity teachers, on one hand, and the activity's management system and materials on the other hand.

In view of the information available so far, the Scott, Foresman Reading System activity appears to be capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils. However, the activity should be considered for deletion from the Title I project since the number of schools selecting the activity has consistently been very low. At the present, there are other activities for schools to choose which may be as effective as SCOTT.

R&E #89
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program (OCC) is one of eight options of Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. Title I pupils have participated in OCC for seven years. Six public schools purchased this activity in fiscal 1980 to serve 350 primary and intermediate level pupils. This option uses the materials of the Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program.

This program reduces dependency on visual images; develops spelling, dictation, work study, and oral reading; and emphasizes effective communication through self-correcting and early writing activities.

One teacher and one aide were to teach five groups of 8 to 12 pupils for 30 to 40 minutes daily.

Inservice meetings were to be held throughout the year by Board of Education personnel and the vendor.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The selection of OCC was based on several factors: the activity's effectiveness in past years; instructional emphasis and methods which best met the needs of the pupils, especially at the primary level; experienced and qualified staff; and sufficient space in which to accommodate the activity.

Most school administrators did not experience problems related to activity selection. The few problems which did surface occurred after program selection and concerned a shortage of teacher aides and the late delivery of materials and supplies.

All participating classes were implemented and operational, with staff and pupils selected well before the objective date of October 15, 1979. A shortage of materials was experienced by a few schools, but they were able to function with the materials on hand.

Procedures for the selection of pupils involved an assessment of the participants' CP/ML levels. The majority were one to one-and-a-half years below grade level. Some of the participating pupils were below this level. Other determinants were test results and teacher recommendations of pupils most in need of remediation. The non-Title I teachers also had input in the pupil selection for participation in OCC.

The majority of tthe OCC schools adhered to the guidelines which concerned the goals of the Individual Learning Plans (ILP). The ILP was designed to set goals in reading for each participant. It provided the teacher with a framework of instructional objectives and also was a vehicle of articulation among teachers who instruct the same child. Most pupils had an ILP prepared by the regular classroom teacher or the Title I teacher which was monitored by the principal and used by the regular Title I teachers.

Staffing

The teachers and teacher aides in OCC were administered a questionnaire designed to assess their opinions concerning the inservices, implementation, and operation of the activity. The questionnaires were completed by six teachers and seven teacher aides.

All responding teachers said that the Title I activity instruction had begun by September 11, 1979. Adequate instructional materials were provided for all levels of pupils. A teacher aide was assigned to each classroom for the majority of the school year. Most teacher aides were experienced. One teacher aide had worked in the activity for six years and another for four years. Three aides were first assigned to the activity in the fall of 1979.

Inservice Training

Publishing company consultants provided a three-hour workshop prior to the implementation of the program and two additional three-hour workshops during the year for participating teachers and teacher aides. The local staff also made periodic special presentations.

The administrators, teachers, and teacher aides were asked to assess the quality of the inservice. There was a minimal amount of variation in the opinions of the teachers and teacher aides. The teachers believed the inservices provided by the program vendor, District Title I coordinator, and local staff were good and helped to improve classroom instruction. According to the teacher aides, the quality of most inservices was good, especially those presented daily or weekly by the local school staff.

Principals' assessment of the OCC inservices varied somewhat from that of the staff members. Some believed they were very effective, while others considered them to be ineffective.

Instructional Program

OCC observations were conducted during the fall and spring of fiscal 1980. The observations were centered on the interaction between the teachers, teacher aides, and the pupils. The instructional activities varied somewhat from classroom to classroom. Most teachers instructed the entire class or a group of pupils. The majority of the teacher aides supervised pupils who worked independently. Other teacher aides tutored one pupil.

The majority of the pupils were on task. The main activity involved reading for a purpose. All observed pupils were attentive to task and appeared to be generally alert, responsive, and motivated by the instruction. The small class size, good leadership, positive learning environment, expert management, and skilled instruction contributed to the behavioral patterns of the participants.

In most classrooms the materials frequently in use were workbooks, worksheets, and paper. A small number of teacher utilized charts and the chalkboard as the predominant instructional materials.

The working relationships of the teachers and teacher aides appeared to be good. The teachers were unanimous in their positive responses concerning the assistance provided daily by the aides. All responding aides believed the teachers gave clear directions and exhibited confidence in their abilities. The daily duties of the aides involved working more than 50 percent of the time with the pupils to provide group and individual assistance with learning tasks.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the reading instruction in the ESEA Title I programs, homeroom teachers of the pupils who attended pull-out activities were asked to complete a questionnaire. The responses to the Non-Title I Teacher Questionnaire revealed the depth of the correlation between these areas of learning.

The respondents reported that most pupils left the homeroom at the same time to participate in Title I activities. The size of the departing group was usually comparable to the Title I class (8 to 12 pupils). If the number of eligible pupils exceeded the specified class size, the group was divided and departed at different periods.

Participation in a Title I activity did not eliminate reading instruction in the home room. However, pupils sometimes missed profitable instruction while away from the homeroom. The subjects most often missed were math and reading. The missed instruction was made up through homework assignments, regular classroom assignments, and special periods of instruction. The most unique method reported was the use of tapes of the missed instruction. The OCC activities correlated well with the school's curriculum.

Over fifty percent of the responding homeroom teachers felt that the participating pupils learned more than if they had remained in the homeroom. This response indicated that these teachers considered Title I instruction beneficial. Three-fourths of the non-Title I teachers understood the methods and objectives of the activities in which their pupils participated. Several teachers believed that participation in OCC increased the personal responsibility and academic efforts of the pupils.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The attitude of a random sample of parents toward the participation of their children in Title I was measured by their responses to a questionnaire.

An analysis of the 72 responses from OCC participants' parents indicated that 75 percent of the parents were aware of their children's participation in a Title I activity. A large number said the amount of time spent assisting their children with homework had increased considerably over the year. Parents also reported that their children had increased in productive use of leisure time. The activity was rated as excellent by most parents. All parents said that they would like to see the activity continued because most felt that their children's achievement levels improved through participation in OCC.

During the school year approximately eighteen out of a possible forty parents came to school, either voluntarily or on request, to discuss the progress or problems of their children. The teachers felt that the parents should exhibit a higher level of active and cooperative interest in their children's school work.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Data in Volume 2 presents the ITBS reading achievement results for Open Court pupils ages seven through ten. Overall, these pupils achieved an average grade-equivalent gain of six months, thus not meeting the eight month gain objective. In all, only 45 percent had standard score gains. This was less than the 60 percent objective.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS-B) were administered to 99 age cycle six pupils to measure their reading achievement. The program appeared to be effective for these pupils, for 50 percent achieved scores above the national mean. This was well above the Title I objective requiring that 40 percent exceed the 50th percentile, as well as above the Title I average.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

OCC cost approximately $296,000 to serve 350 primary and intermediate level pupils. The cost per pupil was $770 or $7.85 per pupil per instructional hour. The cost of the activity was in the upper mid-range of all pull-out reading activities for fiscal 1980.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program was implemented before October. There was a material shortage in a small number of schools, but this did not interfere with the operation of the activity. The staff was experienced and qualified. The inservices were adequate and were conducted according to the guidelines of the activity.

Most parents indicated a degree of knowledge concerning their role in the guidance and education of their children. They expressed a desire to see the program continue next year. One principal felt there should be definite guidelines concerning the depth of the parents' involvement in the program.

Achievement scores partially confirmed the parents' belief in their children's improved learning abilities. The CTBS scores of the OCC six-year olds surpassed those of the overall six-year old Title I participants, with half of them exceeding the national mean. However, none of the achievement objectives for those tested on ITBS were met, and less than half had standard score gains.

RECOMMENDATIONS

-This Title I activity has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing the desired effects.

-Steps should be taken to expedite the delivery of materials and supplies.

R&E #87
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

EMC CORPORATION/SCHMERLER:
PHONETIC/LINGUISTIC READING AND LANGUAGE SYSTEM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The EMC Corporation/Schmerler: Phonetic/Linguistic Reading and Language System (EMC) activity employed five teachers and one aide to serve approximately 190 pupils at the primary, intermediate, and upper levels in one public and four nonpublic schools in fiscal 1980. It was the third year of this activity in the ESEA Title I project in Chicago as an option ofthe Developing Reading Skills and Abilities activity package.

The program provided intensive daily supplementary reading instruction for groups of 8 to 12 pupils. Pupils at the primary level received instruction for 30 minutes; pupils at the intermediate and upper levels received instruction for 40 minutes. Activity diagnostic placement tests were available.

Materials were purchased through the EMC Corporation at $21 per pupil, with an additional $4.50 per pupil provided for supplies.

EMC used phonetic, linguistic, and sight-word principles to help pupils in the first through eighth years of school beyond kindergarten develop decoding and comprehension skills. Instructional activities for each of the three principles were arranged in hierarchies and taught sequentially. Consultants from EMC provided a three-hour workshop prior to implementation of the activity and two additional three-hour workshops during the year assisted by central office and district Title I personnel.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

EMC was selected by two public and four nonpublic schools during fiscal 1980. Information gathered in the fall indicated that most principals selected EMC because the activity best used the talents of the school's staff and had been effective in past years. Cost-effectiveness and the value of the instructional emphasis and methods were also factors in the activity's selection.

Initiation of Instruction

The program was implemented promptly in five of the six sites by mid-October with two minor delays reported in teacher assignments. One site reported not implementing the activity at all because the materials were too restrictive and regimented in design. A phone interview with the principal indicated that these materials would not serve the needs of the pupils and that the teacher could do a better job using a variety of instructional materials. Delivery of instructional materials and pupil scheduling presented no problems, although some delays in delivery of supplies were reported.

Pupil Selection

The linguistic/phonetic approach of the activity was said to be particularly effective with primary and intermediate pupils. Selection was on the basis of teacher recommendations, reading achievement scores, and other evidence of performance below expectations. Additional consideration was given to pupils who had failed to reach achievement goals from the previous year or who might benefit from continuing in a Title I program. The pretests provided by the vendor were reported to be valid for pupil placement

ILP

In the public school, the regular classroom teacher prepared an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) for each pupil. The ILP provided a challenging goal in reading for each pupil and provided teachers with a framework of instructional objectives and a vehicle for articulation among teachers who instructed the same child. Classroom teachers and the EMC teacher met regularly, and also informally, to coordinate the instructional program and monitor pupil progress and program effectiveness. The time spent on record-keeping in Title I continued to cause concern among teachers.

Staffing

Late teacher assignments were reported in two nonpublic sites. Only one site selected the program with an aide option. In the spring, one public school principal, on the Principal Evaluation Form, rated the staff assigned to this program as being very effective. This teacher had worked in the program for three years and was very familiar with the materials and procedures.

Inservice

Several citywide inservice meetings were scheduled during the year. Early in September EMC teachers met with teachers in the other options of Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. For the most part, the joint meetings were rated useful and beneficial by teachers new to the activity, less so by experienced teachers.

One public school teacher, having had previous experience using EMC materials, provided initial inservice training for nonpublic school teachers early in October 1979.

The inservice meetings provided by central office and district Title I personnel gave teachers an opportunity to learn more about comprehension skills, a content area of concern to them. Principals reported that vendor service was average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Interviews were conducted with teachers from one public and one nonpublic school. The teachers indicated that the program did what was expected of it: it used phonetic/ linguistic methods and spelling techniques to develop reading skills.

Although materials aimed at developing dictionary skills and comprehension were reported to be lacking, the structure and design of the program (18 different workbooks covering multiple levels and content areas) were rated "very good" overall. The manual provided structured content and detailed management techniques.

The materials flowed efficiently from simple to complex. Teachers had the opportunity to learn pupils' needs and provide them with the appropriate remediation individually or in small groups. Correlation with Chicago's CP/ML levels was reported as being moderately easy.

One teacher indicated that teaching vocabulary words in isolation was not conducive to total reading comprehension. Using phonetic/linguistic techniques for word recognition and taking words out of context without correlating these words to their place in a sentence reduced the total reading effect.

The activity was observed operating in separate classrooms large enough to accommodate eight to twelve pupils. Because no special equipment was required, no time was lost in installation or maintenance.

Efficiency of Operation

Pupils were observed in both the fall of 1979 and spring of 1980 as being on task, attentive, and motivated. Class routines were well established with minimum loss of instructional time. The activity prompted frequent pupil-teacher interchange because of the small class size and the teacher-directed nature of the activity. The predominant grouping patterns were whole class instruction and, to a lesser degree, independent work on individual tasks. One teacher emphasized that instruction was more effective when pupils were grouped by age and skill. Regular classroom teachers indicated that they noticed increased pupil effort and felt that pupils had learned more as a result of being in EMC.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parent involvement for this activity was higher overall than for other Title I pull-out reading programs. Parents of the pupils participating in EMC were surveyed. Twelve responses were received. Approximately 92 percent of the surveyed EMC parents knew that their child was participating in a Title I program. This percentage exceeded the stated objective of 90 percent.

In addition, 73 percent of the respondents had visited their children's Title I classrooms, on average three times. This visitation by the parents exceeded the stated objective of 65 percent. Over 90 percent of the parents indicated that they had worked with their children on school related activities more in fiscal 1980 than the previous year.

The parents rated this program as excellent and felt that it should be continued. Since this rating reflects the opinion of parents in only one school, a teacher effect may be more influential than the activity effect.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 illustrates the objectives, goals, and results for EMC in fiscal 1980. Results for one public school having 30 matched pre- and posttest scores are presented.

Overall, the public school pupils enrolled in the EMC program did not meet the achievement objectives in reading or vocabulary. The activity, however, appeared to be of most help to those pupils who were below average for Title I pupils.

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this section may be found in Volume 2 of this report.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=30)

	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	62%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	53%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	6 mos.	No

COST EFFECTIVENESS

There were approximately 190 pupils participating in the EMC program at a total estimated cost of $174,145. Cost per pupil was $774. The activity did not require the services of an aide in order to operate efficiently and effectively. This cost was comparable to that of other pull-out reading activities. According to achievement data, the activity did not prove as effective as other Title I reading activities.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

EMC/Schmerler operated in one public and four nonpublic schools in its third year as a Title I ESEA project. The pull-out reading program provided remediation with a phonetic/linguistic format. The structured curriculum and the systematic management techniques may not have been suitable for all schools. Teachers reported that an insufficient supply of instructional materials were provided in the area of comprehension. Implementation generally posed little difficulty; however, a few delays were reported in teacher assignments in the nonpublic schools. In some instances supplies were delivered late.

Inservice sessions were provided jointly to EMC users and to other options of Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. The meetings were rated as being good, especially for teachers new to the activity.

Although primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils were selected to participate in the EMC program, only the eight-year-old participants in the one public school achieved the objective of an eight month grade-equivalent gain in reading. The other age levels did not meet the grade-equivalent gain objective in reading.

Only the twelve-year-old participants met the activity objective of a standard score gain in vocabulary. The achievement data indicated that the program had the greatest impact on pupils with below average pretest scores.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Sites selecting this activity should be aware of the phonetic/linguistic approach of the materials and their correlation with the basal reader. Although the achievement results suggested that the activity was effective for primary level pupils in reading and for intermediate and upper level pupils in vocabulary, the achievement data related only to 30 students in one public school. Therefore, it was not known whether this represented an activity or a teacher effect.

The activity's curriuculum content, somewhat lacking in comprehension skills, was a structured program not providing for a wide variety of innovative teacher techniques. Therefore, teachers should be selected who can operate within the parameters of the program.

Special care should be taken to group pupils by age and skill levels in order to enhance the efficiency of the program.

Because of the unique characteristics of the activity materials, the initial pre-implementation inservice session should be conducted by the vendor consultant or a teacher experienced in the EMC technique in order to provide an appropriate introduction to the materials.

The effectiveness of EMC did not compare favorably with other pull-out reading programs. Over the past three years only a minimum number of schools have selected this activity. Evaluation data for this activity suggest that EMC should be deleted from Chicago's Title I project.

R&E #88
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: Marion Rice

BFA COMPREHENSION/VOCABULARY PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The BFA Comprehension/Vocabulary Program (BFA) was one of several options in the Developing Reading Skills and Abilities activity. BFA enrolled approximately 140 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils citywide from four public schools in a series of learning activities drawn from three components developed by BFA Educational Media. These instructional kits covered comprehension skills, vocabulary skills, and power reading.

Controlled reading and vocabulary levels were essential aspects of the BFA stories which aimed to develop vocabulary through "reading in context." Cassette tapes were available in addition to the boxed sets of materials.

BFA offered two options, one providing one teacher for 35 pupils and other providing a teacher and an aide to serve 50 pupils. Only the 35-pupil option was purchased. Inservice meetings were organized by Board of Education personnel with some consultation provided by the BFA vendor.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Initiation of Instruction

Instruction was begun in all schools by October 15. Correlation of Title I activity materials with Chicago CP/ML Levels was moderately easy.

Staffing

All required personnel were assigned promptly in September. BFA principals gave the activity the highest rating in terms of staffing which placed it above the average rating for Title I overall.

Two-teachers responded to a teacher questionnaire. Both teachers wanted to teach in this activity again. Reaction toward the services of the SCR varied: one teacher was certain that the service had increased awareness of the home situation of the pupils; the other was not sure.

Inservice

Inservice requirements consisted of one half-day of initial inservice and three half-days during the school year. Principals rated the inservice average; this placed it slightly below the mean overall Title I rating for inservice.

Teachers rated inservice and on-site consultations fair to very good. Inservice ratings were consistently higher than on-site consultation ratings.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

The activity required space for 8 to 12 pupils and at least two 110-volt electrical outlets. One unit of the activity was conducted in a space where there were no electrical outlets. Cassette tapes, kits, and workbooks were furnished with the activity. BFA materials were delivered after December 2 in one school. Instruction began with few materials at this school. The necessary cassette players also were not furnished. Materials and equipment were rated slightly less effective by BFA principals than was true of materials and equipment for all Title I activities; however, the vendor service rating exceeded the average Title I rating by a very small amount.

Teacher Questionnaire results indicated that at one school instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for all levels and in the other they were not. One teacher respondent rated the quality of the instructional materials good and the other rated them adequate. Both respondents agreed that the Title I consumable supplies were received in adequate quantity. With respect to individualizing instruction with the materials, one respondent was able to do so to the extent necessary; the other was only able to individualize instruction a little. Neither of the respondents participated in the selection of materials.

Efficiency of Operation

One classroom observation revealed an enrollment of seven students with six in attendance. All students were engaged in reading and all were on task. The percentage of direct instructional interaction time with pupils fell below that for similar activities. BFA classes had been cancelled an average of eight days during the school year; this was consistent with other pull-out activities. Title I teachers who were familiar with other Title I activities felt that this activity was comparatively effective.

Pupil Response

BFA teachers reported that most of the pupils were actively and cooperative interested.

ILPs

Title I teachers communicated regularly with non-Title I staff. Communication took place informally on a weekly basis.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Of the 32 parents of children enrolled in BFA who responded to a sample survey, all indicated that they were aware that their child was participating in a Title I program; this exceeded the 90 percent objective desired for the activity. Ninety-one percent of the parents indicated that they had visited their child's regular classroom or teacher and 50 percent had visited their child's Title I classroom or teacher; this too, exceeded the objective set for the activity. The parents' ratings for the activity surpassed those of parents with children in similar activities. Furthermore, their perception of their child's achievement in the program and their desire to have the program continued were consistently higher than the average Title I rating.

BFA teachers reported a great deal of variability in terms of parents' interest in the activity: many were cooperatively interested but some were noticeably uncooperative.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

For pupils of age cycle seven and older, three achievement objectives were set for BFA. Table 1 indicates that none were met by the activity, although age cycle 11 pupils met the grade-equivalent and standard score objectives in reading comprehension and age cycle nine pupils met the vocabulary objectives.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=66)

Objective	Criterion	Activity results	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	40%	58%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	58%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent	8 mos.	7 mos.	No

BFA appears to have been moderately effective at the intermediate level. For the primary and upper levels, the data were mixed and, because of the small number of students tested, no firm conclusions could be drawn about the activity's effectiveness at these levels.

In terms of the percent of pupils having standard score gains and grade-equivalent gains in reading comprehension on the ITBS, BFA ranked about average for pull-out reading activities. The percent having positive standard score gains in reading was consistent with that of Title I overall; however, the grade-equivalent gain was less, 7 months versus 8 months for Title I overall.

For the three participating schools with ITBS results, the average grade-equivalent gains in reading ranged from 5 months to 8 months and the percent having standard score gains ranged from 50 to 68 percent.

Pupils younger than age cycle seven took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The relevant objective, that 40 percent of the pupils exceed the national 50th percentile, was met. However, this result was based on only four pupils.

Complete achievement results appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

BFA's total estimated cost was $104,452 for 140 pupils in fiscal 1980. The cost per pupil was $746 and the cost per pupil hour of instruction was $6.39. The cost per pupil hour of instruction was quite reasonable for a reading pull-out activity.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Instruction began promptly in most units, even though some of the materials were not delivered until December.

No problems were observed in staffing the one teacher per unit.

Materials were late in arriving; electrical outlets were not always available.

Pupils were observed as actively involved in the instructional program.

Staff communicated regularly, but informally, about the activity.

Parents were aware of their child's participation in Title I; a majority had visited the school and desired to have the activity continued.

BFA teachers perceived the activity as comparatively effective with respect to other Title I activities.

Achievement results on the ITBS were average for pull-out activities. Grade-equivalent gains in reading were below the Title I average but the positive standard-score gains were consistent with Title I overall. Three of the four students who took the CTBS scored above the national average in reading.

Cost was below average for pull-out activities.

Recommendations

Modify activity budget so that all necessary supplies for the activity can be purchased.

BFA should only be purchased by schools that have tape players available.

Vendor ought to deliver materials early in the school year; delays should be eliminated.

This Title I activity has been assessed as capable of meeting the needs of some members the Title I population and is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing the desired effects.

R&E #94
Project #647
Program #7691
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

SRA CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The SRA Corrective Reading Program (SRA), an option of the Developing Reading Skills and Abilities activity, was new to the Chicago Title I project in fiscal 1980. Six public schools and one nonpublic school purchased SRA to serve 355 pupils. In all, eight teachers and five aides were assigned to the project.

This program provided a concentrated direct instructional approach for pupils in the fourth through eighth years in school. Scripted lessons in decoding and comprehension skills were taught sequentially, with immediate feedback. The content material provided continuous reading skill development with a built-in reinforcement and management system. Daily lessons included criterion-referenced measures based on performance objectives which were correlated to the Continuous Progress Mastery Learning continum.

Lessons were designed for use with groups of 8 to 12 pupils. Materials were purchased from Science Research Associates at $17 per pupil. Activity diagnostic placement tests are available. An additional $4.50 per pupil was provided for supplies.

A pre-implementation workshop and two additional sessions were held during the year. Central office, district Title I personnel, and vendor representatives cooperated in these workshops.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

School principals indicated in the fall of 1979 that SRA was selected primarily because the instructional emphasis and methods best supplemented the needs of pupils. In addition, administrators commented that the activity best used the talents of the school's staff, had available space, and coordinated with the school schedule. Other reasons were: cost effectiveness, absence of equipment requirements, and familiarity with the SRA instructional materials. The majority of schools chose the aide option.

Initiation of Instruction

Few implementation problems were reported. Although one school reported that an aide was assigned late and another experienced late delivery of supplies, instruction began in all sites by mid-October.

Pupil Selection

Intermediate and upper level pupils, a minimum of a year and a half behind in reading, were selected to participate in this activity. According to principals, teacher recommendations, scores on standardized tests, and CP/ML reading levels were other reasons for selecting pupils. Selected pupils ranged from those with lower than average (for Title I) pretest scores to those with higher than average pretest scores. More upper level pupils were selected than intermediate.

ILP

For pupils in the public schols an ILP was prepared by the Title I and classroom teachers to coordinate pupil instruction. It was reported that schools conducted formal meetings and consultations as needed. One teacher reported that meetings were held regularly every five weeks. However, most teachers communicated informally at least once a month.

Staffing

No difficulties were reported in assigning staff to this activity. In fact, several administrators indicated they had a specific teacher in mind when they selected the program, and in the pring, a majority reproted tha their staff had been very effective in operating the SRA activity during the year.

Inservice

In addition to consulting with publisher's representatives, teachers in the SRA program attended several citywide inservice meetings held in conjunction with the other options of Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. These meetings were rated "very good" to "average" by administrators, teachers, and aides. Teachers were all in agreement that the inservice sessions helped them improve their classroom instruction. In the first year in Title I, the SRA vendor representative was not able to provide the appropriate pre-implementation workshops. Individual schools were visited to provide additional assistance with direct instructional techniques and the SRA reinforcement system. Teachers were also trained in procedures for testing, scheduling pupils, and selecting workbook levels. The services provided by the vendor did promote proper management procedures.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Most of the SRA classes were held in separate rooms. A large mobile unit served as the instructional area for two units of SRA in one school. The two teachers alternated instructional groups and supervision. The aides in this situation were used primarily to escort pupils. In another situation, the SRA classes shared basement space with another ESEA program (Language in Transition) and occasionally with a parents' group.

All but one teacher reported that an adequate supply of instructional materials and consumables was provided. These materials were rated as being "excellent" to "good." Program materials, however, did not lend themselves easily to innovative techniques or to a great deal of individual instruction, according to teacher comments. In the spring, program managers said the materials did provide supplementary work in reading skill development but were not correlated sufficiently to the citywide reading skill program. These comments indicate that SRA is predominantly group-oriented with a framework that does not individualize instruction to the extent that may be found in other ESEA programs. No special equipment was required since SRA is a workbook-based program.

SRA materials start out easy and gradually increase in difficulty. The succession of tasks, positive built-in reinforcement, and immediate feedback devices the program offers might "trigger" achievement results.

Efficiency of Operation

Fall and spring classroom observations indicated that classes were often taught as a whole group. Occasionally pupils were involved in independent work on a group task. Pupils were all observed working attentively on the assigned task. Classroom observations illustrated total pupil participation as the teacher proceeded through the lesson using programmed techniques and hand signals. Mistakes were corrected immediately and reinforced with additional skill practice.

The observed SRA direct instructional format provided lessons that were repetitious, structured, and cumulative.

The intense group lessons required pupils to respond immediately and in unison. The teachers, trained in the SRA instruction techniques, taught reading using set phrases and signal words.

Some teachers without aides commented that, in order to implement the curriculum effectively and to provide the maximum amount of instruction time, a teacher aide is indispensable. Escorting pupils, supervising independent work tasks, providing individual assitance, keeping records, and helping to prepare instructional materials were among the tasks reported by aides.

However, not all aides indicated that they were called upon to perform the variety of instructional tasks indicated; they would have preferred being given more classroom responsibilities. One teacher commented that aides assigned to participate in Title I programs needed better training in dealing with the curriculum and in working with Title I pupils.

Several interviews conducted with SRA teachers suggested that earning points for performance on each part of a lesson provided positive reinforcement and evidence of success for all pupils. Bonus points were awarded in a variety of ways; typically for such things as classroom behavior, promptness, materials ready, attentiveness, or being able to apply particularly difficult skill tasks. Points were converted into a grade at various times during the year and rewarded with fun days, movies, prizes, etc. Teachers indicated that they liked the motivational aspect of this technique.

Both teachers and aides reported some occasions when SRA classes had to be cancelled. Among the reasons mentioned were being called upon to substitute, inservice meetings, and other school-designated responsibilities.

Interviewed teachers reported that pupils improved in the areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, listening skills, and oral language. The intense nature of the lessons required total participation and created a sense of responsibility for each pupil. The pupil had to listen attentively in order to respond correctly. One teacher said that although some pupils resented the repetition, they did learn.

Most teachers reported that they enjoyed working with the SRA materials and found the activity to be very effective as a supplementary reading program.

Regular classroom teachers indicated that those pupils who participated in SRA had benefited from the instruction they received. In addition, they felt that these pupils exhibited increased academic effort and personal responsibility. The regular classroom teachers all felt that the activity supplemented the school's curriculum.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Teachers of pupils enrolled in SRA were asked to rate the interest of parents. Six teachers completed this rating. On the average, teachers indicated that about one-quarter of the parents were actively interested in the activity; one-half were felt to be interested although not active; the remaining one-quarter were rated by the teachers as not interested. Differences between schools were noticeable; one teacher, for instance, indicated that 95 percent of the parents were actively involved in the activity and in two other schools active parent involvement was totally lacking.

Teachers were also asked to indicate how many parents had visited the school to discuss their children's progress or difficulties. The average number of parents visiting a SRA classroom was 18. This suggests that about one-quarter to one-half of the parents were interested in their children's progress. This proportion was average for all Title I pull-out programs.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 illustrates the standardized test objectives and results for the SRA program in fiscal 1980. Achievement results for 273 pupils from six public schools with matched pre- and posttest scores are provided.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=273)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	62%	Yes
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	9 mos.	Yes

Public school pupils enrolled in the SRA program on the average had a 9-month grade-equivalent gain in reading, slightly higher than the overall Title I grade-equivalent gain of 8 months. Based on pretest standard scores, SRA pupils were lower achievers than average Title I pupils. The standard-score gain in vocabulary of 52 percent fell below the activity criterion as did the overall Title I standard-score gain in vocabulary. However, the pupils in the SRA activity achieved a 62 percent standard-score gain in reading comprehension, which met the activity criterion and slighly exceeded the overall Title I reading gain of 58 percent. The distribution of grade-equivalent gain scores in the six participating public schools ranged from six months to 1.1 years in reading comprehension.

Achievement data from six public schools participating in SRA suggests that pupils with particularly low pretest standard scores at the intermediate level made substantial gains. At the same time, pupils with above-average pretest standard scores did not make comparable gains.

The SRA program was most effective in improving reading comprehension. Comparable gains were not made in vocabulary, although pupils had achieved a 7 month grade-equivalent gain. It appears that instruction emphasis might have been placed on comprehension between pre- and posttests. In addition, pupils had somewhat higher pretest standard scores in vocabulary than in comprehension and gains were not as apparent.

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this section and explanations of the statistical terms used can be found in Volume 2.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Approximately 355 pupils participated in the SRA program at a total estimated cost of $277,106. Cost per pupil was $781.

The activity had no equipment requirements which lowered costs. Without an aide, 35 pupils could be served; however, when the aide option was purchased, 50 pupils could participate and teachers reported that the activity functioned more effectively with increased instructional benefits.

SRA appeared to be comparable in achievement as well as cost to other Title I reading pull-out programs.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

In its first year as a Title I project, SRA operated in six public schools and one nonpublic school. This pull-out reading program provided remediation in decoding and comprehension with scripted lessons and a highly structured format for intermediate and upper level pupils. Those schools selecting the aide option reported easier implementation and more effective programing, particularly when the aide had actively participated in the instruction program and had not just been utilized for escorting and housekeeping purposes.

Other than one incident reported regarding late delivery of supplies, the program had no difficulty initiating instruction. Vendor consultants visited school sites to facilitate the testing of pupils and implementation of the program. Inservice meetings were provided jointly for teachers in SRA with other options in Developing Reading Skills and Abilities. These meetings were well-received, especially by teachers new to the program. Vendor consultants provided additional local school service.

There were considerable differences in achievement scores among the schools selecting SRA suggesting variations in teacher effectiveness in addition to pupil selection.

Intermediate and upper level pupils who had failed to achieve success in improving their reading scores by various techniques and instructional materials benefitted from this direct, structured program design. Upper level pupils, eager to reach grade level scores to graduate, were assisted by this intense reading program that insists on total participation. Pupils do not spend the majority of their time on individual tasks. The greatest degree of individualization occurs when pupils reach comprehension level C. Vendor pretests place pupils at the appropriate skill levels for remediation in both decoding and comprehension.

Recommendations

Grouping low-performing intermediate and upper level pupils with similiar skill needs (not necessarily by age) promotes more effective instruction in both rate and mastery.

The activity appears to be more effective for pupils with lower pretest standard scores, particularly in comprehension. The inconsistent achievement gains in different schools suggests that schools should carefully assess their pupil's needs when selecting supplementary programs.

The services of an aide, as an integral part of the instructional program, would enable the teacher to maximize each 40 minute session. Vendor representatives should supply the necessary training.

Teachers selected to manage the program must function within the constraints of the activity and be aware of the structured techniques employed in the SRA program. Schools should assess staff capabilities and select programs accordingly.

Program materials are scripted and highly structured for group lessons. They are teacher-directed and intense by design. Because of this unique instructional format, it would be more profitable for teachers involved in the SRA option to receive separate inservice training during the school year.

This Title I activity has been assessed as effective in meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for selection by local schools to replace activities not producing desired effects or meeting local school needs.

R&E #11
Project #604
Program #7636
Evaluator: George Dalin

SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR INDIVIDUALIZED READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Support Systems for Individualized Reading (SSIR) activity operated in four public and four nonpublic schools in fiscal 1980, its seventh year of operation in Chicago's Title I project. It served 475 pupils ranging from the first through eighth year beyond kindergarten. As a management and support system, it provided intensive supplementary reading instruction for groups of 8 to 12 pupils. At the primary level, pupils received instruction for 30 minutes daily; at the intermediate and upper levels, pupils received instruction for 40 minutes daily.

Prior to implementation, teachers and aides new to the activity were provided with one day of citywide inservice and additional inservice at the local school. Three days of inservice were also provided during the year by the vendor, Random House, for the 11 teachers and 6 aides in the activity.

All materials and equipment were ordered from Random House. However, two of the four activity options could purchase some instruction materials from parts one and two of the approved list of instruction materials, Language Arts: Reading 1978-81. An additional amount of $4.40 per pupil was provided for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

SSIR was selected by a majority of the participating schools because of the activity's instructional emphasis and methods. Additional reasons for the selection of the activity were effectiveness at other schools, evaluation reports, and the availability of competent reading teachers.

Initiation of Instruction

Class instruction began before mid-September in most of the participating schools. However, full implementation was not achieved in a few schools because all activity materials were not delivered. In schools new to SSIR, teachers had to use available local school materials. This was a major problem in at least two of the eight participating schools.

Pupil Selection

Public school pupil participants were selected primarily on their continuous progress levels. Nonpublic school pupils were selected by scores on diagnostic tests. Some schools focused on primary level pupils while other schools selected pupils from intermediate and upper grade levels.

ILP

Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) for pupil participants were prepared by the classroom teachers. SSIR teachers reported that they conferred with sending teachers on the preparation of ILPs during the first two months of the 1979-80 school year. About half of the Support Systems staff maintained the Title I pupils' Individual Learning Plans. The remaining teachers reported that they shared ILP maintenance with non-Title I staff.

Staffing

A majority of the interviewed principals reported that the teachers they selected for SSIR were very effective. Two of the eight local school principals thought that the activity best suited the talents of their school staff. The teacher aides assigned to the activity were also rated as very effective by their principals. Principals did not report a shortage of qualified teachers and teacher aides.

Inservice

A majority of the SSIR teachers who had attended at least two vendor inservice meetings rated them as good or very good. Vendor on-site consultations as well as district Title I reading coordinators' consultations were rated good or very good. At the spring activity inservice meeting, teachers exchanged information on local school communication with sending teachers and discussed how they were able to integrate skill mastery into reading lessons. Overall, the SSIR teachers felt that the inservice meetings improved their classroom instruction. Principals, however, rated the activity inservice meetings as average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In each school observed SSIR was in operation in a separate classroom. In 57% of the observed classes, the physical enviroment was rated above average, i.e. current student work was displayed on bulletin boards and a good quality of materials and supplies was evident. Twenty-eight percent of the class environments were rated average while fourteen percent were rated below average. The school facilities in which the activity units operated were rated above average.

A majority of the teacher respondents (83%) to a teacher questionnaire reported that instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for all levels; the quality of these instructional materials was rated excellent or good. SSIR teachers learned at the spring inservice meeting that Random House was planning to concentrate on reading material. Although principals rated activity materials and equipment above average, they considered vendor service to their schools as below average.

Classroom observations held during the first semester revealed that pupil participants were working with various kinds of Random House or local school instructional material.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations revealed that 75 percent of the teachers were rated above average in giving clear and organized instruction relevant to the activity format. Lessons adapted to pupil's levels were observed in 87 percent of the observations. The learning environ-ment was above average in 75 percent of the observed classes. Activity teachers in a majority of the class-rooms (71%) gave individualized instruction to pupil participants. Overall, the teacher effect was sound or better than sound in a majority of observed classrooms.

The teacher aide's role was instrumental in classroom operation. The aide assisted the activity teacher in working with small groups of pupils, grading papers, preparing materials, etc.

During the first semester, classroom observations showed that 80 percent of the pupils were working on assigned tasks. The second semester observations revealed that all pupils were working on assigned tasks. In the majority of the observed classrooms, pupils were allowed to express freely their opinions about their work. The observations also indicated that there was very little time loss regarding pupils' activity work.

Pupil Responses

SSIR teachers reported that a majority of their pupils (90 percent) were actively and cooperatively interested in this activity.

In addition, a sample of non-Title I teachers' opinions on SSIR's pupil participants' attitudes showed an increase in the percent of pupils who demonstrated personal responsibility (68 percent) and academic effort (82 percent). However, only 33 percent of these pupils were judged to have improved in service to the school. At least 70 percent of the pupil participants improved in one of the three attitude measures as perceived by the local schools' staff. Therefore, the evaluation objective that at least 70 percent of the pupils would have favorable attitude scores was partially met.

Title I and Regular Staff Communications

All of the activity teachers communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' progress. Eighty percent of the activity teachers met weekly with the non-Title I staff while twenty percent of the Support Systems teachers met daily with non-Title I staff. Half of the Support Systems teachers indicated that their meetings with non-Title I staff were informal, and the other half of the Support Systems staff had formal meetings with non-Title I staff.

SSIR teachers' communication with the School Community Representatives was minimal. This was reflected by 75 percent of the activity teachers who reported that they were not sure or were not aware of their pupils' home situation.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

SSIR teachers were asked to rate parents' interest in the activity. Results showed that the parents who were active and interested in SSIR (23 percent) was slightly below the average percent of parents (25 percent) who were active in Title I pull-out reading activities. The activity exceeded the Title I average percent of parents who were interested but not active. However, the activity had a lower percent of parents who were not noticeable interested than did the other Title I pull-out reading activities.

At least 90 percent of the parents who responded to a parent questionnaire were aware that their children were enrolled in the SSIR activity. More than 75 percent visited their children's Title I classroom and more than 90 percent visited their child's regular classroom or teacher. The two evaluation objectives on parent involvement in the Title I program were met. It should be noted, however, that these percentages are based on only about 14 parents.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The overall achievement gains for the SSIR activity are reported in Table 1. The ITBS achievement objectives were not met by SSIR in fiscal 1980. None of the four participating public schools achieved an eight month grade-equivalent gain nor did 60 percent of the pupils at any age cycle demonstrate a positive standard score gain in reading comprehension. Furthermore, three of the four public schools achieved only a five month gain in reading comprehension; the other participating public school had a seven month gain.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=185)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	51%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	45%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	6 mos.	No

The six-year-old pupils also did not meet the CTBS reading objective. Only 11 percent of the pupils tested exceeded the 50th percentile nationally. The objective required 40 percent.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The cost per pupil for SSIR was $817. The per pupil hour cost was the second highest of all pull-out reading activities. Although a majority of the activity teachers and teacher aides believed SSIR was an effective activity, reading achievement results were poor. Part of the problem may have been that teachers still had not learned to manage the activity optimally and that vendor service was average.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The Support Systems activity produced below average results. Achievement gains in vocabulary were slightly higher than gains in reading comprehension, but the activity failed to meet the reading achievement objectives. The percent of pupils who demonstrated positive attitude changes did not meet the attitude objective. Generally, pupils responded well to the activity format and the teachers were responsive to their pupil's needs. However, some of the activity teachers had to use local school materials for months before they received delivery of SSIR materials. This late delivery delayed the proper implementation of the management system.

Parents seemed receptive to the activity and many visited activity classrooms. But parent participation in the activity was below average. Activity inservice meetings were considered beneficial by SSIR teachers; yet principals considered them as average. Activity teachers set up good communication with non-Title I teachers who sent pupils to the activity, but SSIR teachers' communication with School Community Representatives was minimal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Vendor delivery service to the schools should be completed by the second week of school.

More activity inservice meetings should be considered in order that all teachers may gain an adequate understanding of activity operation.

A review of activity materials should be conducted to determine if CP/ML skills are included.

Schools using SSIR should consider changing to one of the more successful Title I reading activities consistent with their pupils' needs.

R&E #17
Project #573
Program #7622
Evaluator: Marion Rice

LANGUAGE IN TRANSITION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Language in Transition (LIT) enrolled 1,105 pupils ranging from kindergarten to the eighth year of school after kindergarten in 18 public schools in fiscal 1980, its eleventh year in Chicago's Title I project. Most pupils taking part in this program of daily instruction in English as a second language were of limited English fluency (Bilingual Placement Categories A and B) and were enrolled in LIT Component I; the activity offered a second component for children of greater English proficiency. Materials were prepared by the teacher, or chosen by the schools from approved lists and included charts, workbooks, manipulatives, and English language development texts. Cassette tape players and other audiovisual equipment were also on hand. Funds were provided for field trips.

Pupils met in small groups in a variety of school locations which were usually small and often shared with other functions. A teacher and an aide were assigned to each group of 50 pupils or a teacher alone for 35 pupils. The instruction period was flexible and could extend from 30 to 60 minutes per day.

Board of Education personnel and consultants from publishing companies served as resources for the inservice training program.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The two main reasons for selecting the activity were: the activity's instructional emphasis and methods best supplemented the needs of pupils in the school and the activity had been effective at the school in previous years.

Initiation of Instruction

Generally, instruction began on time. Reported delays were due to late pupil testing and selection and to non-delivery of instructional materials. Correlation of Title I activity materials with Chicago CP/ML Levels was somewhat more difficult than for other activities.

Staffing

One teacher or one teacher and an aide were required per unit. Aides were assigned late in a few schools. Staff were rated above average by principals; nevertheless, the rating was slightly lower than the average rating for all Title I activities.

For the 20 teachers who responded to the Teacher Questionnaire the average amount of experience with the activity at the time of the survey was 1.5 years. Eighty-nine percent of the teachers reported that they would like to continue to teach in the activity the next year. For those teachers who had the services of a SCR, 40 percent felt that they were more aware of the pupils' home situations; this was not as great as the 65 percent observed in other activities. At times, language presented a problem in communication.

Results from 11 teacher aides returning the Teacher Aide Questionnaire revealed that 79 percent of the aides were in their first year with the activity; this was fairly consistent with the 77 percent for aides in other activities. All of the aides felt that the teachers were clear in their directions and had confidence in their skills, indicating an excellent working relationship between teachers and aides. Sixty percent of the teacher aides spent more than half of their time working directly with pupils.

Inservice Training

Board of Education and other resource persons provided teachers with instruction in techniques suited to pupils whose first language was not English. No problems were reported with respect to inservice.

The rating given LIT inservices by principals, although average, was slightly below the overall Title I rating. The total number of inservice meetings was somewhat less than was observed in other activities. Results of the teacher and teacher aide questionnaires indicate some disagreement as to who provided the best inservices: the teacher aides felt that the vendor/publisher inservice was as good as or better than other inservices; the teachers perceived the inservices provided by central office and local school personnel as far better. The vendor inservice was rated only fair by 67 percent of the teachers. However, on-site vendor consultations received higher ratings from the teachers than did district and local on-site consultations. Eighty-three percent of the teachers felt that the inservice had improved their classroom instruction; this was consistent with other activities.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

The activity required space to accommodate 20 pupils. Many units were observed operating in makeshift or shared space (corridors, basements, or cloakrooms). Some observers reported distractingly high noise levels from adjacent teachers' pupils, audiovisual equipment, and an engine room. Class scheduling problems were encountered with the use of the maximum time option.

Equipment and materials were selected by the local school from the approved list. Teacher-prepared materials, charts, manipulatives, workbooks, worksheets, and English language development texts were observed. Materials, equipment, and vendor service were rated average by principals, placing them slightly below the average overall Title I rating for materials, equipment, and vendor service.

Results of the Teacher Questionnaire indicate that 80 percent of the teachers felt that the instructional materials in this activity were provided in adequate quantity for all levels; this was typical for Title I. The quality of the instructional materials received lower ratings than those of other activities; only 20 percent rated the instructional materials as excellent. It must be noted that, in this type of activity, finding and incorporating appropriate instructional materials is far more difficult than in other activities. Consumable supplies were not received in adequate quantity by 21 percent of the teachers, presenting a real problem. Only half of the teachers were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary with the materials; 66 percent were able to do so in other activities. The number of teachers involved in the selection of materials resembled that of other activities.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations revealed that the average number of students enrolled was seven and the average number in attendance was six. The percentage of direct instructional interaction time with the pupils was slightly higher than for other academic supportive service activities.

Teacher aides spent the largest proportion of their time engaged in the following activities: assisting pupils individually with learning tasks, assisting pupils with minor behavior problems or personal needs, and supervising Title I pupils outside the classroom. Title I classes had been cancelled an average of 10 times during the school year, which was consistent with the number of cancellations in other activities.

Non-Title I classroom teachers, in responding to a questionnaire, indicated that pupils attending LIT never missed profitable instruction in the home room. An unusually high percentage, 80 percent, said the students benefitted more from the LIT class than if they had stayed in the classroom.

For those Title I teachers who were familiar with other Title I activities, 63 percent rated the activity as comparatively very effective; however, it must be noted that there was no truly comparable Title I activity.

Pupil Response

Language in Transition teachers reported pupils to be actively and cooperatively interested. Positive attitudes of pupils were increased by LIT involvement according to sending teachers. In all, 75 percent noted an increase in personal responsibility and 90 percent an increase in academic effort.

Principals gave the activity an above average rating in terms of meeting its objectives; this was consistent with the average overall Title I rating.

Communication

Language in Transition teachers reported excellent communication with non-Title I staff about their pupils' progress; communication took place informally, usually daily or weekly. Non-Title I teachers also indicated an exceptionally high level of communication with Language in Transiton teachers.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Nine parents of pupils participating in LIT returned the Parent Questionnaire. Six parents were aware that their children were participating in a Title I program; this fell short of the 90 percent objective set for the activity. All of the parents had visited their children's regular classrooms or teachers during the year; however, only four had visited their children's Title I classrooms or teachers. Five parents reported that their children were using their free time more usefully than in the past; 81 percent of the parents of pupils in other activities reported that this had occurred. Most of the LIT parents assisted their children with their homework assignments on a weekly basis. Two parents rated LIT excellent, two as good, three as fair, and two as poor. These appear to suggest considerable variation in parental opinion; the ratings of many other activity were consistenly higher. Even though all of the parents felt that the program ought to be continued, only five felt that their children had achieved more than they would have without the program. Once again, this percentage was slightly less than for other activities.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 demonstrates that LIT pupils met the objective requiring that at least 60 percent of the pupils achieve standard score gains in reading comprehension. The objective requiring eight grade-equivalent months of gain in reading was not met, nor was the vocabulary objective.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=121)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	58%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	64%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No

In terms of the percent of pupils with standard score gains in reading comprehension, LIT ranked second in the distribution of pull-out reading activities; the reading grade-equivalent gain was about average for pull-out activities. The activity compared favorably with overall Title I results in terms of the percent of pupils with standard score gains in reading comprehension, 64 percent versus 58 percent for Title I overall; however, the average grade-equivalent gain was lower, seven months versus eight months for Title I overall. The pretest grade-equivalent scores reveal that pupils in LIT generally had reading scores at the second and third grade levels.

Of the 25 five-year-old pupils who took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, four percent scored above the national average in pre-reading. Of the 93 six-year-olds, 18 percent were above the national average in reading.

Several evaluation objectives dealt with the progress in English of pupils enrolled in LIT. One of these objectives required that 75 percent of the pupils starting the year in Bilingual Instructional Categories A or B should receive a higher placement by the close of the year. The available data, although severely limited (to a total of only 98 pupils whereas about 1,100 were enrolled), suggest 88 percent of the category A pupils and about 72 percent of the category B pupils were reassigned to a higher category.

These results were based on pupils for whom placement categories were recorded both at the beginning and the end of the year. Looking at all 155 LIT pupils with a beginning category, 39 percent were in A, 19 percent in B, 6 percent in C, and 57 percent in NP. At the end of the year, of 176 pupils with placements, 6 percent were in A, 5 percent in B, 4 percent in C, and 86 percent in NP. These data, and those of the previous paragraph, suggest that most pupils made considerable progress in English fluency.

The other objective required proportions of pupils to achieve at least the equivalent of a year's progress in terms of CPML reading levels. At least 50 percent of the category A pupils were to accomplish this; only 28 percent actually did. Seventy or 90 percent, depending on their initial CPML level, of category B pupils were to achieve a year's growth; 64 percent did.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The activity's total cost was estimated to be $732,450, the cost per pupil $663, the cost per pupil hour of instruction $5.04. In terms of cost per pupil hour, LIT ranked among the three least expensive pull-out reading activities.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

Activity selection was based on perceived effectiveness in meeting the needs of the pupils.

Instruction generally began on time; however, there were delays due to non-delivery of materials.

Most of the teachers and aides were in the first or second year of instruction in this activity.

Teachers and aides had an excellent working relationship.

Inservice was average for supportive service-academic activities.

LIT often operated in a makeshift area; on occasion the location presented educational problems.

Teachers found the materials somewhat difficult to correlate with the CP/ML Levels and to use in individualizing instruction to the extent necessary.

LIT teachers' ratings of the activity effectiveness were not as high as for some activities, but non-Title I teachers considered LIT to be very effective.

Pupils were cooperative and actively engaged in the instructional activity.

Communication was excellent between non-Title I and Title I teachers; they conferred informally on a weekly basis.

Only two-thirds of the responding parents were aware that their children were participating in a Title I activity; however, all of the parents felt that the program ought to continued.

Standard score gains in reading were the second highest of all pull-out activities; the grade-equivalent gains were slightly below the Title I average.

LIT was one of the least expensive pull-out reading activities.

Recommendations

Improve the physical location of the activity where necessary so that it operates in more educationally conducive environments.

Allow teachers more involvement in the selection of materials.

Try to retain teachers and aides over multiple years.

Improve parent involvement.

LIT has been assessed effective in meeting the needs of limited English speaking Title I pupils and is recommended for selection by local schools to replace activities not producing desired effects or meeting local school needs.

Summary

Given the poor facilities allocated in many schools to this activity, the results were encouraging. The pupils tested with the ITBS were making good progress. The fact that across all ages the pretest grade-equivalent scores on the ITBS were very low was an indication that students were tested as soon as their English proficiency was at about the second grade level.

R&E #24
Project #589
Program #7503
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

HOME VISITING INSTRUCTION TEAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Home Visiting Instruction Team activity (HV) provided a resource teacher and two home visiting aides who spent a minimum of 45 minutes per week in each of the homes of the participants. In fiscal 1980, its seventh year of operation in Title I, the activity served approximately 400 preschool children, three to five years of age, who resided in the attendance area of eight schools. Each school served approximately 50 preschool children who were not enrolled in any other preschool program. The staff consisted of 8 teachers and 16 teacher aides. It was recommended that each school provide a classroom for weekly parent meetings.

Inservices for all staff were provided by the district Title I coordinator with the assistance of the central office staff. In addition, the aides were inserviced by the resource teacher before each visit.

The focus of the activity was to provide experiences that would aid in the development of communication skills of preschool children by increasing vocabulary and strengthening the ability to describe objects and speak in sentences. Perceptual and motor skills were also developed. Parents were encouraged to use household objects to develop language arts skills and arithmetic concepts.

During the home visits both parents and children participated in the learning activities planned by the teacher and home visiting aides. Between visits the parents worked with the children using the materials and techniques provided in the activity. They also received additional instruction and/or materials at weekly group meetings with the resource teacher. Parents and children were also given an opportunity to participate in cultural field trips planned to broaden the experience of preschool children.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The selection of the Home Visiting Instruction Team program was based, according to most principals of schools in which the program was operational, on several factors. These factors were the program's effectiveness in past years; the instructional emphasis and methods which best supplemented the needs of the pupils; requests by the community and parents for a program which provided needed school readiness training; the unique quality of the program; the good, conscientious parent involvement; the availability of space for a parent room; and the evaluation reports which indicated the past success of the program.

Most school administrators did not experience problems related to the activity selection. One principal felt that the instructional aides should be members of the community because outsiders do not adapt well to home visitations. The parents' acceptance level was felt to be low for persons who resided outside of the community.

All classes were implemented and operational by October 15, 1979. Most schools had a waiting list for prospective participants.

The participating principals were asked to rate the program's effectiveness in the several areas. HV was rated as a very effective program in the meeting of objectives and availability of materials. The staff, the inservice, the equipment used in the program, and the vendor service were all considered to be above average.

Staffing

The principals were equally divided in their assessment of the staff. At the beginning of the school year, three principals rated the staff as very effective and three as average. The overall rating of the staff in the spring by all HV principals was very effective.

During the fall administrative interview the respondents made general comments concerning the staff. Some discussion centered on the need for a better selection process for ESEA teachers. Those with expertise and experience in the program were preferred. Teacher assignments within the school were the responsibility of the principal; however, reassignments to meet faculty integration guidelines and other personnel changes created staffing problems. Occasionally incoming teachers were assigned under the position number of an ESEA teacher.

The newly assigned teacher frequently entered the ESEA activity without experience in that area.

Another comment was related to criticism of the performance of the HV teachers by regular teachers. The remarks concerned the belief of some teachers that the ESEA teachers did not fulfill the teaching requirements. The basis for dissension among some faculty members was probably because the HV staff performed most of the activity's instructional duties outside of the school. The in-school activities were usually related to preparation and parent involvement meetings.

A positive statement by one principal indicated that the one-to-one or one-to-two child/teacher ratio provided intimate contact between the teacher and child. An additional comment referred to the need for local community input in the selection of the instructional aides.

Inservice

The district coordinators assigned to Title I provided three days of inservice training to new teachers and teacher aides and one day of inservice for staff continuing in the activity. Two half-day inservice sessions for all staff were provided during the year.

The teachers and aides rated the inservices provided by the coordinators and publisher representatives as excellent and useful to the program's implementation. The teachers also felt that the inservices provided valuable ideas and materials for the improvement of classroom instruction and successful parent meetings.

The initial inservices were conducted by ESEA administrators and district coordinators. The inservices were held at the Center for Urban Education. The participants were the teachers, instructional aides, publisher's representatives, and an evaluator from the Department of Research, Evaluation and Long Range Planning.

The topics covered at these initial inservices included an introduction to the guidelines of HV, budget information, material and equipment availability, field trips, the evaluation, vendor services, and the role of the administration and district coordinators.

Among the activities at the initial and follow-up inservices during fiscal 1980 were:

-A discussion and demonstration of how teachers could correlate Continuous Progress and the Alphaphonics materials.

-A day at Northeastern University's Teacher Center to construct manipulatives, games, instruction charts.

-An inservice on nutrition presented by the Illinois State Council on Nutrition.

-A discussion and sharing period concerning parent activities covering field trip destinations and fund-raising.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The HV teachers and instructional aides transported the learning materials from the school to the homes of the participants. The instruction kits included a variety of materials such as: puzzles, worksheets, crayons, pencils, scissors, books, and manipulatives which were used for counting, color, and number recognition.

The scenario of a typical HV class session was the teacher and/or instructional aide, child, and parent seated at a table in the home, engaged in a readiness lesson. The instructional program procedure encouraged the parents to emulate the instructor and to assume the role of teacher during the week between class sessions.

During the visits by the evaluator, the pupils were observed engaged in a variety of readiness activities which included handwriting, tracing, coloring, number recognition, drawing, cutting paper, pasting, color and shape recognition, gross motor activities, listening to stories, and reciting rhymes. A selected group of these activities were conducted in each home. The presentation of the instruction was organized, clearly presented, and adapted to the readiness level of the participants.

It is not unusual, because of a short attention span, for the preschool child to find it difficult to remain on task for the entire 45-minute instruction period. Such inattentive or restless behavior can create discipline problems. During these observations, however, there were no discipline problems. All observed pupils were attentive to tasks. They were alert, motivated, and responsive to the instruction. The setting was conducive to learning because there were no external interruptions such as TV, radio, or family conversations. The atmosphere, the instruction, and the behavior of the pupils contributed to the program's positive effect.

Most classes were conducted at the dining room table. Telephone books were often used to elevate the child. The lighting was natural and supplemented by an overhead fixture, but it was usually good. The rooms were well ventilated and comfortable.

The instructional aides and the resource teachers worked well together. The resource teachers and instructional aides, because of security reasons, often travelled together during the home visits. It was an acceptable HV procedure for one family to host the children of two or more neighboring families during the 45-minute instruction period. This was a reciprocal action and it was the responsibility of the visiting families to see that their children were present for instruction. The failure of a parent to follow this procedure did effect the adult-pupil ratio distribution. It was not unusual, during home visit observations, to see three HV staff members and the parent engaged in the instruction of one or two children.

At the end of each session, an assignment with appropriate materials for use during the coming week was given to the parent.

Parent Involvement

Parent attitudes concerning themselves and their children as they participated in Title I were measured by their responses to a Parent Questionaire. Analysis of responses from the HV parents indicated they all were aware that the program their child was participating in was a Title I funded activity.

The HV parent component was unique because the instruction was centered on the parent and child. The parents' presence during the instruction session assured the children of the importance of the parents as teachers. More than 85 percent of the parents said that they had worked with their children more in fiscal 1980 than in previous years.

Parents were asked how often they assisted their children with homework assignments. Just over half of the parents said daily. Since the parents were instructed to work with their children daily on the assignments given each week, this result appears to indicate that many parents could have improved their participation.

The schedules of the home visits were sometimes disrupted. This was usually a consequence of one parent or another to refuse to bring their children to the designated home where the class was being conducted.

The majority of the parents rated the program as excellent and 21 percent said it was good. Ninety-three percent of the parents believed that their children achieved more during the year than they would have without the program. All respondents felt that the program should be continued next year.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The Chicago EARLY Assessment was administered to preschool children (age cycles three and four) on a pre- and posttest basis. The purpose of the Chicago EARLY Assessment was to give teachers a systematic means of collecting information for educational planning. The instrument yielded a score in each of five skill areas. These were Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Language, Visual Discrimination, and Memory. Each score was translated into a percentile rank. As a general rule, children who scored below the 30th percentile in any of these areas were considered to be in need of special remediation.

Posttest information was used to measure the extent to which the activity was meeting the specified objective. This objective required 75 percent of the preschool pupils who scored below the 30th percentile in one or more areas of the pretest to achieve improved scores in those areas on the posttest. As Table 1 indicates, this objective was met in all areas.

TABLE 1. CHICAGO EARLY ASSESSMENT RESULTS (N=328)

	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Language	Visual Discrimination	Memory
A:	146	180	146	170	187
B:	53	79	58	72	93
C:	91%	82%	83%	89%	81%

N = number who had pretests in fall, 1979
A = number scoring below thirtieth percentile on the pretest
B = number of those in line A who were posttested
C = percent of those in line B who achieved percentile gains

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The HV program cost approximately $400,603 to serve 400 preschool pupils in fiscal 1980. The cost per pupil was $1,002 or $38.11 per pupil instructional hour. Based on the cost per pupil instructional hour this program was the most expensive fiscal 1980 Title I program, if one counts only the hour the teacher spends with the child. The hourly cost would be reduced considerably if the hours the parents spent instructing the children between visits were included.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Home Visiting Instruction Team was implemented by October 15, 1979. The activity was requested by the community and parents because it provided needed school readiness training. Parent involvement was considered to be exceptional. With two instructional aides in addition to a teacher on each team, HV provided an unusually high adult-pupil ratio.

The principals' assessment of the staff improved as the year progressed. Among the principals' favorable comments concerning the program were the intimate contact between the teachers and children, the conscientious involvement of the parents, and the community's interest.

The results of the pre- and posttest administration of the Chicago EARLY Assessment indicated most of the pupils achieved improved scores. Based upon these findings, the children should enter the regular school setting prepared to meet the challenge.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reduce the number of instructional aides to one per unit. Two aides per unit are useful but given the other staff and the number of children served, retaining both is too expensive.

Some thought should be given to the revision of the guidelines. A possible suggestion is to require parents to accompany their children to school and sit with them, as at home, during the instruction period. A class should not exceed ten children, or a sixty minute instructional period. This suggestion is offered primarily to reduce costs and increase the number of pupils served.

HV has been assessed effective in meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for selection.

R&E #98
Project #232
Program #7636
Evaluator: George Dalin

TEACHING READING THROUGH LITERATURE WITH THE NEWBERY AWARD SERIES

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980, a new activity for upper age cycle pupils, Teaching Reading Through Literature with the Newbery Award Series (NEWB) operated in six public schools and served 450 upper level pupils. Seventy-five pupils participated in the activity in each school. A teacher and one aide were to provide groups of 12 to 15 pupils with a minimum of 225 minutes of individualized reading instruction weekly.

Principals were requested to select teachers who had special training in reading or who had demonstrated special competency in the teaching of reading to Title I pupils and who were interested in the offerings of the school library. The vendor, Academic Learning Systems, would provide a one-day inservice session for teachers and aides prior to the implementation of the activity, and two half-day inservice meetings during the school year. ESEA Title I coordinators also were to provide local school inservice and technical assistance.

Activity materials consisted of selected Newbery Award literature. Activity books were used to stimulate interest in creative writing, fun and games, craft activities, and questions pertaining to the Newbery Medal or Honor books. In addition, 225 student take-home books for a home library, an automatic filmstrip projector, headsets, and cassette players were included. Each school received an amount of $3.50 per pupil for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Principal interviews revealed that half of the schools selecting NEWB did so because of the activity's instructional emphasis and methods. Other reasons for selection were that the activity best fit the available classroom space, and that the activity furnished additional staff to the school program.

Initiation of Instruction

Pupils were selected primarily on their Continuous Progress levels. Other criteria for selection were teacher recommendations, diagnostic test results, and CRT results. Class instruction began before mid-October in all of the participating schools. In a few schools, board supplies for the activity had not been delivered by mid-October. Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) were in the process of being completed for pupils during October.

ILPs were prepared by either Title I teachers or regular reading teachers. Monitoring of ILPs was done by the district Title I reading coordinator and/or the local school principal. Title I teachers and non-Title I teachers with pupils in the activity were planning to use ILPs to pace pupil's reading skills progress.

Staffing

None of the principals reported a shortage of qualified teachers or teacher aides for the activity. A majority of the principals rated their NEWB staff as very effective. Only one principal rated his NEWB staff as average.

Inservice Training

A majority of the activity teachers, in response to a teacher questionnaire, rated the vendor inservice meetings as good or very good. One teacher, however, rated the vendor meetings as fair. At one representative inservice meeting, activity teachers shared effective teaching techniques and materials. Some teachers displayed art projects which were used to supplement activity materials. In addition, the Title I reading coordinator discussed developing a literature program with the NEWB teachers.

Vendor on-site consultations were rated by a majority of the activity teachers as good or very good. District Title I reading coordinators' on-site consultations were also rated as good or very good. A majority of these teachers indicated that the inservice meetings improved their classroom instruction. Activity teacher aides rated the vendor's inservice meetings as good, and they rated the district Title I reading coordinators' consultations as very good. Half of the principals rated the vendor inservice meetings as very effective, and the other half rated these meetings as average. Vendor service at the local school level was rated as very effective by a majority of the principals.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In half of the observed school facilities, NEWB operated in a separate classroom. The other half were operating in shared classrooms. One NEWB teacher was dissatisfied with the small class space which caused an overcrowded condition for each pupil group. In most of the observed classes the physical environment was rated above average.

Activity teachers had student work on display, and they also put illustrations of Newbery Award winning books on display. The school facilities in which four of the activity units operated were rated above average. The other two units were in facilities which were rated average.

All activity teachers were provided with an adequate quantity of instructional materials for all levels. A majority of the activity teachers rated the quality of instructional materials as excellent. However, some of the teachers had to supplement reading skill material for some of the more challenging Newbery books. Many of these teachers reported Title I consumable supplies adequate in quantity. The majority also stated that they were able to individualize instruction with Newbery materials. Correlation of the Newbery materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels was moderately easy or very easy. Most of the principals rated activity materials and equipment as very effective.

Fall classroom observations revealed that 41 percent of the pupils were working with some kind of instructional materials, but 55 percent were listening and watching. Spring classroom observations showed that most pupils were using NEWB materials. It should be noted that some pupils relied too much on the audiovisual NEWB materials rather than reading a Newbery book in its entirety.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations revealed that activity teachers were either instructing one pupil (64 percent) or supervising pupils' tasks (36 percent).

All of the activity teachers were rated above average in giving clear and organized instruction relevant to the activity format. The use of lessons adapted to pupils' levels was rated average (67 percent) or above average (33 percent). A majority of the teachers (67 percent) were rated above average in giving their pupils clear directions and assignments. Pupils' opinions on activity lessons were allowed in all observed activity classes. This was reflected by observations which rated all activity teachers as pupil-oriented rather than subject-oriented. All NEWB teachers were rated above average in their individualization of instruction, i.e. in meeting the reading skill needs for each pupil. Despite the apparent good classroom performance of NEWB teachers, in 66 percent of the NEWB classrooms there was significant time loss in getting instruction underway.

During the first semester, classroom observations showed that approximately 70 percent of the pupils were working on assigned tasks. But more than 20 percent were not on task. The second semester observations revealed that 89 percent were working on assigned tasks. A majority of the pupils (89 percent) were observed as doing seat work, silent reading, or listening. NEWB teachers maintained at the vendor inservice meeting that pupils' group work on the NEWB materials was part of the activity. However, group work was not observed during the school visits.

Pupil Responses

Activity teachers reported that a majority of their pupils (80 percent) were actively and cooperatively interested in the NEWB activity format. Eleven percent of the pupils were interested but not actively involved in class activities. The remaining nine percent were not noticeably interested or were noticeable uncooperative.

A sample of non-Title I teachers' opinions on NEWB pupil participants' attitudes showed an improvement in attitudes toward school, academic work, and personal responsibility. With the available attitude data, at least 70 percent of the pupil participants improved in one of the three attitude measures.

Title I and Regular Staff Communications

All of the activity teachers communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' progress. Informal meetings were held daily by two activity teachers, weekly by two teachers, and monthly by one teacher. Most of the non-Title I teachers with pupils in NEWB (90 percent) indicated that NEWB teachers shared information on their pupils' progress. Seventy-nine percent of the non-Title I teachers with pupils in the activity reported that the NEWB activity teacher gave a special presentation on the activity format.

ILP maintenance was an ongoing effort between NEWB teachers and non-Title I teachers with pupils in the activity.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Eighty-two percent of the surveyed parents reported that they were aware that their children participated in the NEWB activity. A majority (85 percent) had visited their children's regular classroom or teacher during the school year. Approximately 60 percent visited their children's special Title I classroom or teacher. More than half of these parents (59 percent) indicated that they worked more with their children on reading skills during the fiscal 1980 school year than the previous year. Close to 80 percent assisted their children with homework assignments daily or weekly. Many parents (70 percent) believed that their children used their free time in a more useful way. Parents (72 percent) rated overall activity effectiveness as excellent or good, and they believed that their children achieved more academically because of the NEWB activity. A majority of these surveyed parents thought that the activity should be continued. Despite the positive responses from many of the parents, the NEWB activity did not meet the two parent objectives.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The overall reading achievement gains for the Newbery activity are illustrated in Table 1.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=365)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent of Pupils with Standard Score gains	60%	55%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	58%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	Yes

Overall, the NEWB activity had a mean grade-equivalent gain of eight months, which met the evaluation objective. All age cycles except age cycle 14 met this objective, as did five of the six participating schools.

However, the other achievement objectives--at least 60 percent of the pupils will have positive standard score gains in reading comprehension and vocabulary--were not met. Only age cycle 12 pupils met the standard score objective in reading comprehension, and only age cycle 14 pupils met the vocabulary objective. Standard scores on the pretest indicated that the average pupil in NEWB was above-average for Title I, and an examination of the tables in Volume 2 shows that NEWB was most successful with helping the eligible pupil who was above-average for Title I but well below the citywide average.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Newbery had the lowest cost per pupil, $521 or $3.96 per pupil instructional hour, of all the pull-out reading activities. In terms of achievement results Newbery was low-average as a pull-out activity, because of lower grade equivalent gains for the upper age cycles and poor standard score gains. However, principals and activity staff viewed the activity as effective in the sense that upper age cycle pupils were given good literature to read. Schools which selected the activity were seeking an activity which would stimulate reading or upper age cycle pupils, and these schools apparently did not want a pull-out activity which simply emphasiz[illegible]ding skills.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

Newbery was viewed as effective by a majority of principals and activity teachers. Reading achievement gains were low average and not enough pupils made adequate gains in reading comprehension or vocabulary. Some of the Newbery award books were too difficult for the pupils. Some of the activity teachers had to supplement activity materials to assist pupils in their learning of new reading skills. Also, pupils relied too much on audiovisual NEWB materials thus diminishing the goal of the activity which was to read good children's literature.

Vendor inservice meetings were considered beneficial by the activity staff. NEWB teachers were given the opportunity to share effective teaching techniques and materials at vendor inservice meetings. Vendor service was considered very effective by a majority of principals with the activity in their schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Schools which select the Newbery activity should be allowed to choose Newbery books which best meet the reading skill needs of their pupils.

Teachers who are selected for the Newbery activity should have an adequate background in children's literature.

NEWB audiovisual materials should not be used as a substitute for reading NEWB books.

NEWB teachers should institute group discussions on each book in order to lead pupils to a better understanding of what is read and to increase vocabulary.

This Title I activity has been assessed as being capable of meeting the needs of the local schools' Title I participants in selected situations. If a more effective activity is available, which is consistent with teachers' and pupils' needs, replacement is recommended.

R&E #25
Project #592
Program #7625
Evaluator: Mavis Hagemann

A KINDERGARTEN AND PRIMARY LEVEL PROGRAM OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION WITH AUGMENTED STAFFING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing (AS-KP) has been a Title I activity in Chicago since 1967. In fiscal 1978 it became two activities separated by age groups, one for kindergarten and primary and the other for intermediate and upper level pupils.

In fiscal 1980, AS-KP was implemented in 68 public schools serving approximately 4,140 pupils. Responsible for the activity were 243 teachers, 125 of them funded by Title I, and 125 aides. There were two options for kindergarten: the half-day option was present in 12 schools, the whole-day option was selected by six schools. The activity was chosen for all primary age cycles, including older (age cycle nine) pupils.

This activity was designed to enable teachers to individualize instruction to accommodate a variety of learning styles and meet the educational needs of the pupils by providing a small-group class structure. Each group of 30 Title I eligible pupils was to be divided into two classes of fifteen each. The two teachers would share the service of an aide. It was preferred that each class have its own room, but in several schools two classes co-existed in one room with a divider. Instruction was to include the regular Chicago curriculum as well as supplementary reading and language components keyed to individual needs. Monies varying from $20 to $25 per pupil, for supplementary locally-selected materials and supplies, were to be allocated as part of the activity.

The teachers and aides in this activity were provided a minimum of three days of inservice training by their respective district Title I coordinators. These inservices varied from district to district, as did the activity from school to school. The district coordinators also provided assistance and guidance to the teachers and administrators throughout the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Because there were no designated materials or instructional approach, AS-KP was primarily chosen for its self-contained structure and small class size. Interviews with administrators showed that most believed a self-contained situation is the most beneficial for primary level pupils and that reduction of class size is essential to really help the slow pupil. Several principals reported that they placed their slowest pupils in AS-KP rooms, and pretest standard scores indicated that this was generally true.

About one-third of the schools that selected this activity were new to the activity. Continuing schools appeared to be relatively unconcerned about good achievement results, for only one of the twelve schools that had had almost no gains on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) in fiscal 1979 dropped the activity.

Initiation of Instruction

Although instruction in AS-KP began in all schools in September, there were some problems with full implementation. Shortages of materials, equipment and supplies were reported in one-fourth of the schools as late as mid-October. At that time, five schools were still without assigned aides.

Pupil selection presented a problem for full implementation in only two schools. Kindergarten pupils were selected on the basis of lowest scores on the Kindergarten Checklist. Most primary pupils were chosen on the basis of their placement in the lowest Chicago CP/ML levels. Many principals reported choosing pupils who were most immature. Three principals reported their AS-KP classes served low achieving bilingual pupils. In all, 57 percent of the principals reported in the Administrative Interview that they placed their slowest pupils, as perceived by them, in this activity.

Staffing

Since this activity functioned as a regular classroom, with the exception of the small enrollment and supplementary reading, staffing of this activity presented no problem, as reported by the principals. Responses to the Principal's Evaluation Form revealed that teachers in this activity were not rated as effective as were those in the average Title I activity; however, only three percent were considered ineffective.

Spring classroom observations of AS-KP revealed that the average rating for teacher effectiveness, on a scale of one to five with one being least effective, was 2.75. This was below the average rating of 2.99 for all Title I teachers. It suggests that the best teachers were not always assigned to this activity.

According to the Teacher Questionnaire the average teacher in AS-KP had taught in this activity for more than two years. However, more than three quarters of the aides were new to the activity.

Inservice Training

Because inservices for this activity were the responsibility of the different district Title I coordinators, there was no uniformity of inservice quality or content. This diversity may account for the lower-than-average rating that principals assigned the AS-KP inservices on the evaluation form.

Teacher questionnaire responses showed 84 percent rated the district inservices as good or very good. Almost all of the surveyed aides also felt the inservices were good. Individual on-site consultations by the coordinators were reported to be very helpful. About half of the teachers reported having attended vendor inservices, possibly to help select or implement the AS-KP program. These inservices were not viewed as being very helpful on the average, although teacher remarks indicated a need to know more about different supplementary materials.

Significantly, in spite of the high ratings for the inservices, only 75 percent of AS-KP teachers, as compared to 83 percent of all Title I teachers, said the inservices improved their classroom instruction. This suggests that the inservices were not always directed toward the classroom (or teacher) needs. In fact, most district inservices were quite general in nature and combined teachers serving pupils of all ages from five through 14. Perhaps there should be separate inservices for teachers of kindergarten and primary pupils that would give more specific classroom instruction help.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In 75 percent of the schools with AS-KP, classes were held in ordinary classrooms. In the remaining schools, classes were in shared classrooms. In most cases, the evaluators who observed the classes judged these shared facilities to be somewhat less than adequate for successful implementation of the activity. Exceptions to this perception were cases where the original classroom was large enough to encompass two classes.

Equipment and materials varied from school to school, since these were school-selected items. Principals felt the materials and equipment were merely adequate. Even though two-thirds of the teachers had selected them, teacher ratings of the quality of the instructional materials were lower than the average for Title I. This could reflect a lack of adequate money to spend for the most desirable materials or it could mean that not enough information for intelligent selection of appropriate supplementary materials was available.

Teachers were asked to indicate what supplementary reading materials they used. Responses varied from none, to a potpourri, to specific materials which were the basis for other vendor-serviced activities in Title I. Many teachers commented that they needed to supplement the materials with purchases of their own in order to provide adequately for individual needs.

Only 62 percent of the teachers felt they had materials that enabled them to individualize instruction adequately, 30 percent felt it could be done with difficulty, and eight percent said they couldn't individualize instruction at all. Correlation of instruction with the Chicago CP/ML levels was considered to be much easier in AS-KP than in most activites.

Efficiency of Operation

Overall, AS-KP operated as an average self-contained Title I activity. As revealed in fall and spring classroom observations, about one-third of the time in AS-KP classrooms was spent in whole class instruction or supervision and one-third in partial class instruction. Seatwork was the predominant pupil task observed (44 percent of the cases) and most of these pupils were working on worksheets or from the chalkboard. Rooms were generally attractive and assignments given clearly. Several observers noted that there was little to distinguish an AS-KP room from a regular classroom except for the class size.

The evaluators who did the observations were asked to rate the degree of good implementation on the part of the teacher. Of the 137 observations, the average rating was a little less than "sound implementation." This may have been because of the lack of individualization which was supposed to be a part of this activity.

Teachers were asked to compare AS-KP with other Title I activities as to effectiveness. Sixty-eight percent of the responding AS-KP teachers rated it as being "very effective"; 75 percent of all teachers in Title I rated their activities as being "very effective." Also, fewer teachers than in most activities indicated that they'd like to teach in the activity again. Thus, teacher perceptions of AS-KP were not generally positive.

Teacher aides were not present in half of the observations, as one might expect since they were shared between two rooms. The aides were used for a variety of purposes, but they reported their duties as being focused on assisting pupils in some way. Almost all of them indicated that they assisted pupils individually with learning tasks, and most of them conducted small group instruction or practice. Teacher directions were not always perfectly clear to some of them, but all of the aides felt the teachers had confidence in their skills. Overall, 90 percent of the aides felt comfortable with the Title I teacher and were satisfied with the assigned responsibilities.

Pupil Response

A majority of pupils in AS-KP were generally observed to be attentive, but from 10 to 20 percent were perceived to be below-average in attention, some of them completely off task and obstructive. Given the size of an AS-KP class, this translates to one or two pupils per room and is not surprising considering the kind of pupil (lowest achieving) who was typically placed in the activity. Certainly the shared classroom situation had an effect on the level of pupil attention also.

Most of the observers could not judge whether classes were pupil or subject oriented. Student input, while not generally rejected, was not eagerly welcomed by the teachers either. In only 13 percent of the observations was there recitation or oral reading, surprisingly low for a program for young pupils.

Teachers were asked to rate the pupils' interest in the activity. By their estimates, about three-fourths of the pupils were actively and cooperatively interested. They indicated that an average of one or two pupils per classroom was uninterested or uncooperative. This correlates well with the observational data.

A sample of parents revealed that almost all of them regularly helped their children with homework, suggesting that the children were willing to work at home.

Sixty-eight percent of the parents said the children had achieved more than if they had not be in the activity. This percentage was much lower than that in other self-contained Title I activities. Parents were also asked to rate the activity. There appeared to be some dissatisfaction for, compared to the average response for all of Title I, fewer gave it an excellent rating and more rated it only fair.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parents of AS-KP pupils were, according to teachers, as interested in the activity as were most parents of pupils in self-contained activities; i.e., 34 percent were actively interested, 36 percent were interested but not active, 23 percent were not interested, and 7 percent were uncooperative. About two-thirds of the surveyed parents had discussed their children's progress with the teacher. Communication between the home and the Title I teacher was good, as was true for all Title I self-contained activities.

Only three-fourths of the parents were aware that the child's participation in a class of only 15 pupils was due to Title I. All sampled parents responding to a questionnaire had visited the child's classroom. Most of them worked with their child at home.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Because this activity served young pupils who were tested with several instruments, achievement assessment must be viewed separately for each test. Gain scores on the ITBS provided a measure of the academic growth of age cycles seven and above.

As shown in Table 1, all of the ITBS objectives were met or almost met by the activity as a whole. Thus, on average, the achievement needs of these pupils appeared to have been met as well as in most Title I activities.

Mean reading comprehension gains for individual schools varied considerably for this activity. One school had no gain and the others ranged from one month to 2.2 school years. Six schools had mean standard score gains of more than 10 units, mean grade equivalent gains of more than one school year, and improved the percentile rank of all or almost all of the pupils in AS-KP. In contrast, 11 schools had a loss in average standard scores, almost no

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N = 1187)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	62%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	59%	No
-Mean grade equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	Yes
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	61%	Yes
-Mean grade equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	Yes

grade equivalent gains, and decreased the percentile rank of most of the pupils. Thus the range of individual school achievement can be seen to be very wide and the teacher and the supplementary materials to be of utmost importance to successful implementation of AS-KP.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) was administered to kindergarten and age cycle six pupils. Results were computed as standard scores based on a national mean of 50 and a standard deviation of about 21.

Kindergarten pupils in AS-KP had a mean standard score of 39 in reading and 42 in mathematics, showing they tested as low-average. In all, 26 percent of the kindergarten pupils scored above the national mean in reading and 40 percent in mathematics. There was a considerable spread of scores, with scores in each stanine.

Age cycle six pupils had a mean standard score of 37 in reading and 42 in mathematics, which were also low-average. Twenty-six percent scored above the national mean in reading and 37 percent in mathematics. Here, too, scores were spread over all stanines.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

This activity cost $1,213 per pupil making it one of the most expensive Title I activities for fiscal 1980. It met the needs of many pupils in many schools and was considered by several principals to be an effective use of the money.

Other alternatives, however, should be considered when examining costs. Developing Language Arts Skills at the Kindergarten and Primary Level (DLAS), an umbrella activity offering three self-contained activities within it, also served kindergarten and primary levels. One unit of this served 60 pupils for a cost of $989 per pupil, more than $200 per pupil less than AS-KP. In fiscal 1980, 19 schools served at least 60 pupils (2 or more units) in AS-KP, and 10 of the 19 used materials which were the same as those used in one of the activities in DLAS. In these schools, consideration should have been given to choosing the specific activity desired under the DLAS umbrella, for it would have cost $13,500 less and would have enabled the teachers to be trained in the specific approach.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The self-contained approach of AS-KP was perceived by many principals to serve most effectively young children who were the most in need of reading help.

On the average, teachers in AS-KP were judged to be somewhat less effective in classroom instruction than those in other activities.

In fiscal 1980, 25 percent of the schools with AS-KP had shared classrooms; these situations were judged to be less than desirable.

Inservices varied between districts and, while highly rated, often weren't perceived by teachers or administrators to help class instruction.

Achievement varied greatly from school to school, suggesting that the activity was poorly implemented in many schools, although it was effective in others.

AS-KP was one of the most expensive Title I activities and, for many schools, was not cost-effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teacher selection is critical to the successful implementation of this activity; teachers should have a good knowledge of the teaching of reading so they can help select the appropriate materials and can use appropriate instructional strategies.

Separate inservices for kindergarten and primary teachers should be provided and should be designed to help teachers with classroom management and instruction.

Wherever possible, separate classrooms should be provided for each pupil group if this activity is chosen.

This activity is capable of meeting the needs of the kindergarten and primary pupils in Title I and should be continued where it is successful. However, achievement results should be examined by each principal before continuing this activity year after year.

R&E #26
Project #623
Program #7626
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

AN INTERMEDIATE AND UPPER LEVEL PROGRAM OF INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION WITH AUGMENTED STAFFING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing (AS-IU) was designed to augment the regular teaching staff by providing one teacher and one teacher aide in addition to the board-funded teacher for each group of 32 intermediate and upper level pupils. In fiscal 1980, Augmented Staffing's 14th year in Title I, 73 public schools implemented AS-IU involving 124 Title I teachers, 124 board-funded teachers, 124 teacher aides and 3,968 pupils. An additional classroom was to be provided for each Title I classroom.

Schools implementing AS-IU were expected to design their own curriculum, to provide maximum reading instructional time, and to offer individual help for each pupil. To provide an individualized instruction program, teachers were advised to administer a diagnostic test in reading and mathematics to participating pupils. Instruction was then to be planned and provided according to the pupil's diagnosed strengths and weaknesses. Various instruction materials, methods of presentation, and assessment techniques were used to allow each pupil to progress at his own rate. Teachers responsible for instruction were to allocate maximum time to language development, the improvement of reading, and associated communication skills.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

From all accounts, instruction in AS-IU began by the second week of September. This early initiation of instruction was possible since many of the schools with this activity had used it for several years and thus many of the implementation procedures were known to them. The schools that selected the activity cited the activity's instructional emphasis and methods as the primary reason for their choice. In addition, according to the principals who were interviewed about their selection of Title I activities, a number of features made AS-IU a popular choice with schools. These were: (1) the small class size, (2) the availability of a half-time teacher aide, and (3) the provision allowing schools to use locally selected materials as well as the best talents of the local school staff.

Staffing

The activity was intended to involve 124 Title I teachers. However, this appears to have been modified at the time of implementation for the records indicate 129 teachers were finally engaged to operate activity classes. The previous Title I experience of these teachers averaged 1.[illegible] years. This low level of experience in Title I activities probably indicates the extent to which transfers of teachers within the school system affected AS-IU. In terms of general teaching experience and professional qualifi-cations, however, the activity teachers were above average. This assessment was made by 53 principals who completed the Principals' Evaluation Form for Title I activities.

With respect to the assignment of teacher aides, it appears schools were unable to fill all their positions. According to information from the Teacher Questionnaire, approximately three percent of the activity's teachers reported operating the activity without the required teacher aide. The experience level of the teacher aides in the activity appears to have been even less than that of teachers. Of the 61 teacher aides who completed the Teacher Aide Questionnaire, 78 percent reported being in their first year, thus a large number of teacher aides may have been still in the process of learning how to operate an individualized instruction program.

Inservice Training

In order to facilitate operation of AS-IU and to enhance its effectiveness, an inservice training program was provided. These inservices were provided in each district by the district Title I coordinator. There were mixed feelings, however, regarding the quality of the inservice program. Although 84 percent of the teachers and about 30 percent of the teacher aides rated the inservice meetings attended as either good or very good, twenty-two percent of them did not believe the inservice program, in general, improved classroom instruction. It is only natural to find mixed reactions towards the inservice component of the activity, since the teachers were reacting to different meetings arranged in different districts for different teachers. Among principals, 53 rated the inservice program slightly above average. This indicates a general agreement with the teachers in that among principals as well as among teachers there were mixed feelings towards the effectiveness of the AS-IU inservice program as it related to improving classroom instruction. While some felt the program was effective in meeting teacher needs, others did not seem to share that viewpoint.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

During the fall, a total of 169 observations were made of activity classes to obtain a comprehensive and detailed picture of the prevailing classroom environment in AS-IU. In spring, additional visits were made as a follow-up of the earlier observations. The most important findings are discussed below.

Organization

The facility used for this activity was found to be a regular classroom in 95 percent of the observations. In five percent of the cases, evaluators observed unusual space used for classes, such as hallways or closets. In 12 percent of the observations, two class groups shared the same room. Schools that used unusual space, rather than combine groups in the same room, were probably reacting to the requirement in the activity description for schools to provide an additional classroom. The predominant class size in this activity was 15 pupils per group, conforming to the general design of the activity. Thus, where two class groups shared the same room the number of pupils averaged 30 pupils per room. With respect to the age cycle of the pupils, evaluators observed more intermediate age cycle pupils than pupils in the upper age cycles. This finding was not surprising since preliminary plans in Reading: Top Priority had indicated such a situation would exist.

Of the 169 classrooms visited, the teacher was present with the class in 92 percent of the cases. The teacher was absent from school in four percent of the observations. In four percent of all cases, the teacher was either on field trips or attending a district inservice meeting. There is very little evidence to indicate that activity teachers were used as substitutes in other rooms.

In the instances where the teacher was absent from school, the evidence indicates that the class was covered. A number of methods were used: providing a regular substitute teacher from the Central Office (36 percent); using the local school staff (18 percent); combining two class groups (18 percent); cancelling the Title I class (18 percent); and assigning the teacher aide to be in charge (10 percent). These figures indicate that cancelled classes were less frequent than was customary in other Title I activities.

In 75 percent of the cases where teacher aides had been assigned to AS-IU, the aide was either in one of the assigned rooms or at duties outside the classroom but related to the activity's operation. The aide was said to be absent from school in 12 percent of the observations, which was a little more often than in other Title I activities. Instances where the teacher aide was assigned duties unrelated to the operation of the activity accounted for eight percent of the observations and in a further five percent the aide's duties could not be explained.

Implementation of Instruction

During the fall observations, special attention was given to methodologies and strategies in the various activity classes. Evaluators found that reading was the subject emphasized in 64 percent of the observations. Mathematics was emphasized in 20 percent of the cases; and in 16 percent some other subject was being studied. These data suggest that the major focus of classroom teaching was reading, with mathematics taking second place. This finding appears to be in line with the purposes for which the activity was designed and the needs to be served.

The atmosphere in the classrooms visited was considered to be typical of other classrooms in general. The effort of teachers was rated average. An average rating was given also to the clarity and appropriateness of lessons taught in the clasrooms. The degree to which individualization seemed to take place in the rooms was rated a little lower than average. This finding is surprising since AS-IU is the one Title I activity in which individualization had been expected to be at the highest level, in keeping with the name of the activity.

Classroom Management

Within the activity classrooms, the common practices in the arrangement of pupils for instruction appear to have been primarily the whole class method, followed by partial class groups, particularly when the teacher aide was present. The teachers' activities included providing instruction in 66 percent of the observations, supervising pupils at learning tasks (22 percent), housekeeping (4 percent), marking papers (3 percent), disciplining (2 percent), and testing (2 percent). Thus, it appears most of the teacher's time was spent on teaching and supervising. Correcting pupils behavior or disciplining did not seem to occupy much of the teacher's time and such instances were rarely observed. Much of the paperwork, apparently, was done by the teacher aide. The role of the teacher aide, in addition to marking papers, was observed to include instructing groups or individual pupils, supervising pupils,and housekeeping.

Materials Used

The materials used in AS-IU frequently included workbooks and worksheets (27 percent of all observations), textbooks (22 percent), chalkboard and charts (15 percent), and manipulatives and other materials (5 percent). In 29 percent of the observations, no materials were used. The finding of no materials in use is not surprising, since these observations were based on what individual pupils used at the time evaluators were in the rooms. By comparison, the percentage distribution of materials used in other self-contained activities was: workbook or worksheets (29 percent), chalkboard and charts (18 percent), textbooks (17 percent), miscellaneous (6 percent), manipulatives (2 percent), writing materials (1 percent), hardware (1 percent), and learning kits (1 percent). The percentage of observations where no materials were in use in the other self-contained activities was 25 percent. Thus the differences between AS-IU and other self-contained activities appear to be small in as far as materials are concerned.

Level of Pupil Involvement

The activities of pupils in the AS-IU activity classrooms included seat work or desk excersises (55 percent), listening or watching demonstrations (20 percent), recitation (10 percent), silent reading (6 percent), taking tests (5 percent), and other activities (4 percent). The extent of pupils' involvement was indicated by being on-task, in 91 percent of the observations and waiting for tasks or being off-task in 19 percent of the cases. This picture of pupils' level of involvement does seem to have conformed to the general pattern of behavior in self-contained activities in general.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

A Parent Questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of parents of Title I pupils to measure the extent of their involve-ment in Title I activities. Eighteen of those who returned the questionnaire responded to items dealing with AS-IU. All the respondents indicated that they were aware of their child's involvement in the Title I activity and they all had visited their child's room. Fifty percent of the parents worked with their child at home but less than one-half (47 percent) believed their child had achieved more in school in fiscal 1980 than in previous years. On the question of whether the activity should be continued, 94 percent of the respondents were favorable to the idea. Thus the data suggest a state of ambivalence on the part of parents. The majority of them would like to see the activity continued, and yet they are not sure if the activity really helped their child. In spite of the ambivalence on the part of the parents, it appears the two objectives dealing with parental involvement in the activity were successfully attained. That is, the 65 percent objective expecting parents to visit their child's teacher and the 90 percent expectance level for the parents to be aware of their child's participation in the activity were both met.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Reading Comprehension Gains

Table 1 provides information on the extent to which AS-IU was effective in meeting Title I reading objectives. The table provides information on pupils tested on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. Complete tabulations of these data and explanations of terms appear in Volume 2 of this report.

TABLE 1. READING COMPREHENSION RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score Gains	Grade-equivalent Gains
8	34	239	241	44	.7
9	522	231	234	56	.6
10	724	230	233	59	.7
11	580	230	233	64*	.8*
12	536	231	234	62*	.8*
13	423	231	235	63*	1.0*
14	177	229	233	69*	.9*

Table 1 presents results only for those pupils for whom it was possible to match pretest scores with their posttest scores. For each age cycle, the number of pupils with matched scores represents no less than 76 percent of the pupils who were reported in the activity and more than 91 percent of the pupils whose posttests were reported. An asterisk appears if an evaluation objective was met.

AS-IU appears to have been effective in improving reading comprehension skills of pupils mostly at the upper age cycles, 11 through 14. These four age cycles exceeded the objective that 60 percent achieve standard score gains and the objective requiring eight grade-equivalent months of gain.

None of the remaining age cycles, 8 through 10, met the criteria for either the standard score or the eight months reading objective. Although each of the three age cycles appears to have made some improvement between the pre-and posttests, the gains made were not significant enough and the proportions of pupils improving their achievement were not sufficient to meet the criteria.

Vocabulary Gains

Table 2 provides information on the extent to which AS-IU effected an improvement in vocabulary knowledge among Title I pupils.

TABLE 2. VOCABULARY RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score Gains	Grade-equivalent Gains
8	33	240	243	73*	1.0*
9	538	235	237	54	.5
10	729	233	235	53	.6
11	582	233	235	51	.6
12	537	233	234	55	.6
13	413	231	235	61*	1.0*
14	174	230	234	61*	.9*

The table indicates that age cycles 8, 13, and 14 attained the standard score vocabulary objective and the grade-equivalent gain objective. Age cycles 9 through 12 do not appear to have done as well as the other pupils. Although each one of these groups made a slight improvement, neither the standard score nor the grade-equivalent objectives were met.

Mathematics Gains

For pupils in age cycles 8 through 14 the goal of AS-IU was to improve the pupils' mathematics competency in problem solving and computation skills by at least 8 months. Further, the objective specified that 60 percent of the pupils would achieve a standard score gain in mathematics as measured by the Mathematics Total score on the ITBS. Table 3 provides information on the extent to which these objectives were met.

TABLE 3. MATHEMATICS RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score Gains	Grade-equivalent Gains
8	34	247	248	47	.7
9	539	239	239	53	.6
10	707	237	237	48	.6
11	578	234	236	57	.8*
12	528	234	234	49	.7
13	418	232	235	61*	.9*
14	172	229	233	60*	.8*

The table indicates that the only pupils who seem to have profited in mathematics in a significant way were the pupils in age cycles 13 and 14. Sixty-one percent of the 13-year-olds and 60 percent of the 14-year-olds met the standard score objective. In terms of grade-equivalent gains, the 13-year-olds gained 9 months and the 14-year-olds gained 8 months. All other age cycles failed to meet the criteria for either the standard score or the grade-equivalent objective. These results indicate that the mathematics objectives were not achieved by AS-IU.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The AS-IU activity appeared to be a popular choice with schools for a number of good reasons. First, the small class size provided an opportunity to give pupils individual attention. Second, the activity provided an opportunity for teachers to make their own decisions in the selection of materials deemed effective with Title I pupils in their school. Third, the activity provided the teacher an opportunity to structure the entire school day, rather than just part of it, according to the needs of pupils.

The extent to which the opportunities provided by the AS-IU activity were utilized advantageously in the classroom, however, remains in doubt. So far, the evidence available seems to suggest that the degree of individualization of instruction is below expectations. One of the contributing factors to the lack of full implementation in many of the activity classrooms may be the teacher transfers of recent years. These resulted in a situation where many teachers probably unfamiliar with the techniques of individualized instruction replaced those who were being trained. In addition, the process of individualizing instruction probably requires much more in the way of teaching devices than is generally realized.

So far, too much reliance seems to be placed on workbooks or worksheets, and to a lesser extent on the textbook. It would seem that this activity, which catered to some of the neediest of Title I pupils and was designed to individualize instruction, needs to have at the disposal of the teacher a sufficient variety of materials and equipment to suit the varying learning styles of the pupils.

In as far as the achievement of pupils is concerned, the effectiveness of AS-IU remains in the average category for Title I. In fiscal 1979 the achievement gains for pupils were average for Title I pupils; at the upper levels, however, the gains were above average. In fiscal 1980, older pupils had below average gains for Title I pupils, but continued to do better in all areas and younger pupils continued to fail to attain expected levels. If the activity had been fully implemented, the aberrations in the achievement of pupils of various age cycles might be attributed to the differential effects of the AS-IU activity. Such a statement, however, cannot be made unless the activity has first been fully implemented across all age levels. Hence, all that can be said for now is that the differences in achievement among the various age cycles must be a result of some other factor.

In view of the evidence presented in this report, the following recommendations are made:

> The AS-IU activity should be continued. The concept of individualized instruction offers a greater promise to Title I pupils than any other alternative.
>
> The inservice component of the activity should be made more rigorous and augmented with close supervision in the classroom to ensure that teachers have the support needed to implement the project.
>
> Further serious attempts should be made to supply the classroom teacher with the necessary teaching hardware, audio equipment and additional software to the conventional textbooks, or workbooks, to facilitate the individualization process.

R&E #84
Project #607
Program #7638
Evaluator: Marcia Kurland

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA'S LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES IN READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Encyclopaedia Britannica (BRIT) was one of three self-contained approaches in the Developing Language Arts Skills at the Kindergarten and Primary Levels activity. In fiscal 1980, its fifth year in Title I, BRIT was purchased by nine schools for 60 kindergarten and 600 primary pupils. The kindergarten option, purchased by one school, was taught by one board-funded teacher, one Title I teacher, and two aides in two half-day classes of about 15 pupils each. At the primary level, ten Title I teachers and 20 board-funded teachers, each with a teacher aide, taught classrooms of approximately 20 pupils each.

Materials used for this approach were published by BRIT. The schools provided a projector, record player, and art supplies as well as the basal readers.

The emphasis in the kindergarten option was on pre-reading skills. The primary option focused on a detailed language program including decoding, word-attack, vocabulary, and word construction skills.

BRIT provided six days of inservice for new teachers and aides; four of the days occurred before implementation and two days during the school year. Continuing teachers participated in three of the inservice days.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Encyclopaedia Britannica was selected by principals to fit the needs of their school and to serve their lowest achieving primary pupils in a self-contained setting. One principal selected BRIT for pupils who couldn't handle structured primary programs.

Initiation of Instruction

This activity was fully implemented at the start of the school year; teachers and pupils were selected and materials were promptly delivered in adequate quantity for all age levels. Two of the nine participating schools, however, did have problems procuring teacher aides. Chicago CP/ML levels and teachers recommendations were the major criteria used for pupil selection. Low pretest standard scores as well as staff responses to questionnaires verified that pupils selected for participation in BRIT were indeed the most in need.

Staffing

Many of the principals gave the staff assigned to BRIT at their school a lower than average rating. The majority of responding teachers and aides were new to this activity in fiscal 1980. Aides spent most of their time attending to classroom duties. The majority of their time was spent working directly with pupils, more so than aides in other Title I activities. Questionnaires indicated there was good rapport between the teachers and teacher aides.

Inservice Training

Inservices as well as on-site consultations provided by Encyclopaedia Britannica received the highest rating by teachers of all self-contained Title I activities. All the teachers felt that these inservices did improve their classroom instruction. As in many Title I activities in fical 1980, the majority of teachers were new to this activity; therefore, inservice training was a vital element in the success of this program.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment and Materials

All BRIT classes operated in adequate facilities. However, three mobiles were used for this program at one school. Vandalism and theft in these mobiles forced the teachers to transport materials and equipment to the main school building at the close of each school day.

Teachers and principals rated BRIT materials as excellent. The quality of these materials as rated by the teachers and principals was far above the average ratings of other Title I self-contained activities' materials. Teachers were able to individualize instruction with BRIT materials for all age levels. As in most Title I activities, there was some difficulty correlating these materials with Chicago's CP/ML skill levels.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations in the spring of 1980 revealed that the teacher effect within this activity was excellent. This was one of the highest ratings of all Title I self-contained activities. In that this program was not as structured as some Title I activities, selection of an appropriate teacher was important. Pupils were observed in both the fall of 1979 and spring of 1980 as being on task, attentive, and motivated. Classroom instruction was well organized with minimal loss of instructional time.

Most pupils were reported by the surveyed teachers to be extremely active participants and interested in the materials as well as classroom instruction. Very few pupils were found to be uncooperative. This overall pupil rating was the best for any of the Title I self-contained activities. Observations by evaluators verified these teacher responses. Over 90% of the observed pupils were found attentive and working on assigned tasks.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Most surveyed parents (92%) were aware that their children were enrolled in this Title I activity. All of the parents responding to a questionnaire had visited the classroom and all wanted the program to be continued. Thus, the parent objectives for this activity were achieved.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

BRIT has become more effective in the past two years. Why it was performing better in fiscal 1980 than in previous years is not totally clear. In fiscal 1980 pupils with extremely low pretest standard scores were selected. In fact, BRIT pupils had the lowest standard scores on the ITBS reading comprehension pretest of any of the primary level Title I activities (bilingual programs excluded). All of the ITBS achievement objectives were met as may be seen in Table 1.

There was a wide range of school averages in grade-equivalent gains for the five schools which had ITBS results: school means of one month to 14 months of gain were observed in reading comprehension and five to eleven months in mathematics. Only two of the five schools met the 60 percent positive standard score gain objective in reading. On the other hand, all achieved the standard

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=154)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	63%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	63%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	9 mos.	Yes
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent with Standard Score gain	60%	72%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	1.0 yr.	Yes

score gain objective in mathematics. The school with the lowest achievement encountered administrative problems throughout the year.

CTBS-B results show that only 19 percent of the six-year-olds exceeded the national average in reading, 20 percent in mathematics. Overall, the two CTBS objectives were not met, but BRIT fell far below the reading and mathematics objectives due to extremely low achieving pupils being selected for the program. Achievement data for the kindergarten program could not be evaluated.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Self-contained activities that lower the pupil/teacher ratio are generally more expensive than pull-out or laboratory activities. The cost per pupil, in fiscal 1980, was about $989 for BRIT pupils. Overall cost were $652,988. The overall results suggest that BRIT was quite cost-effective.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

BRIT was selected for very low achieving primary pupils; their pretest standard scores were the lowest of any of the Title I primary level pupils.

Inservice conducted by Encyclopaedia Britannica received the best rating by BRIT teachers when compared to the other Title I teacher ratings. Most teachers were new to the activity and they felt that inservices did help them improve classroom instruction.

All of the ITBS achievement objectives were met. The mean grade-equivalent gain in reading comprehension was nine months. Sixty percent of the pupils achieved a positive standard score gain.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As this program is not as structured as some of the other Title I self-contained primary activities, it is recommended that the teachers selected for this activity be one who can individualize instruction.

This activity is effective for extremely low achievers at the primary level. It is recommended for continuation in those schools where it is producing desired effects.

R&E #38
Project #607
Program #7638
Evaluator: Marcia Kurland

CRANE READING SYSTEM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Crane Reading System (CRANE) is one of the three self-contained approaches in the Developing Language Arts Skills at the Kindergarten and Primary Levels activity. In fiscal 1980, its fifth year of operation in Title I, CRANE served 240 kindergarten pupils and 1,020 primary pupils at 13 schools.

Four Title I teachers and four board-funded teachers (all with an aide) taught two half-day kindergarten classes each in groups of fifteen. At the primary level, seventeen Title I teachers and 34 board funded teachers (all with an aide) taught approximately 20 pupils each.

This activity, like all self-contained activities in Title I, increased the school's staff by providing an extra teacher.

CRANE provided multisensory materials for instruction in reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Reading materials included practice and skill books and readers. Basal readers were supplied by the local school. Maximum time was spent on language development, reading readiness, and developmental reading.

The CRANE vendor provided one three-hour workshop for instructional staff prior to the program's implementation as well as one workshop for parents. Additional vendor service was available upon request.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The Crane Reading System was selected by the same schools in fiscal 1980 as in fiscal 1979. Interviewed principals felt this activity had been effective for their kindergarten and primary pupils as well as best using the talents of the school's staff.

Initiation of Instruction

In fiscal 1980, interviews, staff questionnaires, and classroom observations found all of the CRANE classes were implemented at the 13 participating schools at the start of the school year. Three schools, however, did report problems: two were without aides and one had not received all the necessary instructional materials.

Primary pupils selected were those considered "most in need"; the selected primary pupils were the lowest achievers who would benefit from a small self-contained classroom. Standard scores of the five-year-old pupils were high, of the six-year-olds low for Title I pupils. Pretest standard scores for the seven-year-old pupils tended to be high whereas pretest standard scores for eight-and nine-year-olds were low.

Staffing

Forty-three percent of the teachers responding to the Teacher Questionnaire stated they were new to CRANE instruction in fiscal 1980. Three of these teachers were assigned to the activity as late as January and February of 1980. These changes in teacher assignments during midyear may have affected the continuity of the activity in these schools. Principals evaluating their CRANE staff rated these teachers higher than most principals in other Title I activities.

Inservice

In that so many teachers were new to this activity, inservice training was vital. Questionnaire responses from the teachers indicated that CRANE inservices were good. District Title I coordinator meetings were rated quite high by the surveyed teachers. CRANE received the best rating by the teachers of all the self-contained activities. Overall, the majority of teachers felt that both CRANE and district Title I coordinator meetings did help improve their classroom instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

All of the CRANE classes were operating in adequate facilities. However, there were supply problems cited by a few teachers. CRANE materials were not provided for all age levels. Teachers rated the quality of instructional materials average. About one-third of the surveyed teachers reported that the correlation of CRANE materials with Chicago's CP/ML levels was difficult. During the spring 1980 Selection Conference, three principals chose to drop this activity at their schools for fiscal 1981 because of the problem of correlating CRANE materials with CP/ML skill levels.

Efficiency of Operation

Observations conducted in the spring of 1980 showed the CRANE clases had better than sound implementation. The physical and personal atmosphere was excellent. Most of the class instruction was group oriented but with little evidence of individualized instruction. Teachers did feel that CRANE was effective. Fifteen percent of the queried teachers, more so than any of the Title I activities, desired not to continue teaching this activity. This was also reported by teachers in fiscal 1979.

Pupil Response to the Activity

Observations conducted in the spring of 1980 revealed that most pupils were on task and were attending to their assigned classroom duties. These pupils were more attentive than most pupils in other Title I self-contained activities. Teachers felt that their pupils were actively interested and cooperative.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The majority of parents responding to a questionnaire were aware that their children were enrolled in this Title I activity and 89 percent of them had visited the classroom. Thus, the parent objectives were met for CRANE in fiscal 1980. The class-room teachers also reported that 40 percent of the parents were interested as well as active in this activity.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

As can be seen in Table 1, none of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills objectives were achieved in 1980. Based on low ITBS pretest standard scores, pupils at age cycles eight and nine were lower achievers than the average Title I pupils at these age cycles. Their grade-equivalent gains in reading comprehension were only five months and seven months respectively.

The individual school's average gains in reading comprehension ranged from zero months to 1.5 school years. Five of the eleven schools reporting test results met the ITBS achievement objectives. The remaining schools had average gains of less than five months.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=358)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	56%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	50%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	6 mos.	No
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent of with Standard Score gains	60%	56%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	6 mos.	No

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills measured the achievement of kindergarten and age cycle six pupils. Forty-two percent of the kindergarten pupils scored above the national mean in reading and 41 percent in mathematics. These pupils scored higher in reading comprehension than the other kindergarten pupils in the Developing Language Arts Skills at Kindergarten and Primary Levels activity, but not in mathematics. Only 24 percent of the age cycle six pupils scored above the national mean in reading; 37 percent in mathematics. This was below the average for Title I activities.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In fiscal 1980, the cost per pupil enrolled in CRANE was about $989 and the total cost about $1,245,800. Although these costs were reasonably low for Title I self-contained activities, the poor overall achievement results suggest that at most schools CRANE was not cost-effective. The results at a few schools suggest more is possible from this activity if it is well implemented.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

A large percentage of teachers were new to this activity in fiscal 1980; therefore, inservice training was vital for sound implementation. The district Title I coordinator meetings were considered more beneficial by the CRANE teachers than the vendor inservice meetings. Many teachers and a few principals found the correlation of CRANE materials with Chicago's CP/ML levels to be more difficult than with materials in other Title I activities. This may account for an unusually high number of teachers not wanting to continue teaching this activity.

Overall, none of the achievement objectives were met. However, CRANE kindergarten pupils scored higher than most Title I kindergarten pupils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

CRANE materials should be revised to better correlate with Chicago's CP/ML levels.

The kindergarten option of CRANE is capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation in schools where it is producing the desired effects.

The primary option of CRANE has been assessed as meeting the needs of Title I participants at some schools. If a more effective activity is available, which is consistent with local school needs, replacement is recommended.

R&E #15
Project #607
Program #7638
Evaluator: Mavis Hagemann

DISTAR PROGRAM IN READING AND LANGUAGE

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Distar Program in Reading and Language (DISTAR), one of the instructional approaches under the Developing Language Arts Skills at the Kindergarten and Primary Levels umbrella, has been a Title I activity in Chicago since 1972. In fiscal 1980 it was in 12 schools, serving 240 kindergarten and 900 primary level pupils. Only two of the schools were new to the activity. Fifty-three classroom teachers, each with an aide, had an enrollment of approximately twenty primary or fifteen half-day kindergarten pupils each in a regular sized classroom. Nineteen of the teachers and all of the aides were funded by Title I.

DISTAR materials, published by Science Research Associates (SRA), provided lessons which were scripted for teacher and aide and used a basically phonetic approach to teach reading and an early developmental program to teach language. Accent was on skill mastery in a sequential manner. Classes were self-contained and taught the regular Chicago curriculum while providing the SRA/DISTAR approach for additional reading and language instruction.

In fiscal 1980, one day of inservice for teachers and aides new to the activity was provided by SRA/DISTAR prior to the implementation of the program, as well as a day of inservice for the principals of schools that selected DISTAR. A unique inservice plan designed to utilize on-site consultation and inservice was implemented during the year. Two experienced DISTAR teacher consultants visited every classroom at each site at least once to observe, demonstrate, and offer consultation about the implementation of DISTAR in the specific siutation.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In fiscal 1979 DISTAR was selected by 11 schools. Ten of these selected it again in fiscal 1980 and two new schools added it. Interviews with administrators showed selections to be primarily based on previous effectiveness as well as a perception of the activity as best meeting the needs of the school. Typical comments indicated that the administrators especially liked the highly structured nature of the activity and the fact that DISTAR is self-contained with a small class size and an aide.

Initiation of Instruction

DISTAR was implemented in all schools by September 10, except for one in which implementation was delayed for a week and another which experienced a delay in the assignment of an aide.

Those kindergarten pupils with the lowest scores on the Kindergarten Checklist were selected to participate. New primary level participants were in most cases selected using a combination of Chicago Continuous Progress levels and professional judgment that indicated the need for a structured approach. Some principals tried to give each pupil two continuous years in DISTAR to firm the reading foundation.

Staffing

Teachers were generally well-qualified and several had many years' experience in DISTAR, but half the respondents to the teacher questionnaire were new to the activity in fiscal 1980. Aides were also well-qualified, but three-fourths of them were new to the activity. This was unfortunate, for the inservice plan was designed around the fact that almost all of the schools were continuing and not new.

Principals responding to an evaluation form reported that all teachers and aides in DISTAR were very effective.

Inservice

One day of inservice for teachers and aides new to DISTAR was provided by SRA prior to implementation in the fall; however, several teachers were not able to attend and some sent substitutes. Because the specific teaching strategies which must be used for successful implementation of DISTAR are best learned from observation and practice before use with pupils, those who were not present began instruction at a disadvantage.

On-site consultation and inservice was provided by two experienced DISTAR teacher-consultants at least once for every classroom. Some sites were visited several times at their request and others desired minimal inservice. The consultants found good implementation in most schools but there were some teachers who failed to use the materials and approach adequately and who wanted no help. This information was shared with principals at the spring inservice.

DISTAR's inservice plan involved getting a commitment from the principals and administrators of the program as well as from the teachers and aides. An inservice was held in September for the administrators to provide them with enough knowledge of the activity to determine compliance on the part of the teachers and to inform them of the services which SRA was willing to provide in case of need. In March at a similar inservice administrators learned how things had progressed from the consultants' viewpoints and areas of concern were shared. It was at this time that it became clear that the critical element to good implementation was teacher acceptance of the concept of one lesson each day.

Inservices and consultations by the vendor were rated by almost all teachers as good or very good and by principals as effective. Central office staff consultations were less well-received in several instances.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

All DISTAR rooms were of adequate size as judged by evaluators and had an average of 20 pupils enrolled. In more than half of the observed classes the physical environment was rated above average. Instructional materials were viewed as very effective and in adequate supply by the surveyed administrators.

Teacher respondents to a questionnaire rated DISTAR materials as follows: 49 percent excellent, 41 percent good, 8 percent adequate, 2 percent poor. Most of the teachers felt the materials allowed individualization of instruction. Correlation with Chicago CP/ML levels was perceived to be moderately easy by most teachers, but some found the correlation to be rather difficult.

Some kindergarten teachers were observed using the DISTAR language program in addition to the prescribed pre-reading program. These teachers were impressed with the progress of their pupils in language development. They felt that DISTAR materials filled a need which was not met in the usual kindergarten program and that it would help the pupils in future years in reading comprehension.

Efficiency of Operation

Twenty-three of 25 spring classroom observations of DISTAR found lessons were adapted to pupils' levels of learning and assignments were given in an intelligible manner. The instructional content was judged to be organized and clear, and almost all of the observations found a well-structured learning environment. As might be expected from implementation of an activity with scripted lessons, teachers were found to be more subject-oriented than pupil-oriented, and only 20 percent of the teachers were observed individualizing instruction.

In both spring and fall observations, small group instruction was the dominant mode in DISTAR; there were few observations of whole-class instruction or independent task work. On the average, DISTAR teachers spent much more of their time instructing than did teachers in any other Title I self-contained activity. Pupils were observed to be more attentive and involved and they participated orally much more than in other self-contained activities.

The teacher aide's role was of optimum importance to the efficiency of the activity. By being assigned to one room all day, the aide was used to help with instruction more than most aides; in fact, 73 percent of the teachers said the aide never had duties which conflicted with Title I. Almost all of the teachers reported that the aide helped reinforce learning by conducting group instruction every day, but the results of an aide questionaire did not consistently agree. In general, aides spent at least half their time working directly with pupils.

Pupil Response

Classroom observations revealed that 86 percent of the pupils exhibited average or better attention. There appeared to be a minimum of instructional time lost, which was exceptional for a Title I self-contained activity. DISTAR classes were generally observed to be teacher-directed, with little pupil input allowed.

A sample of parents revealed that 79 percent of them felt they had worked more with their children during fiscal 1980 than the previous year. In addition, 90 percent indicated that their children had improved in use of free time.

DISTAR teachers were asked to rate the pupils' interest in the activity. They reported that 87 percent were actively and cooperatively interested. Only one percent was noticeably uncooperative.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Although DISTAR teachers rated only one-third of the parents as being actively and cooperatively interested, 63 percent of the teachers reported that all parents had discussed their children's progress or problems with the teacher at some time. Overall, DISTAR teachers had conferences with an average of 17 out of a possible 20 parents. This showed a remarkable parental involvement. School-Community Representatives were reported by most of the teachers as helping them improve the home-school understanding.

Parental awareness of children's participation in Title I is usually lower in self-contained activites than in pull-out activities, and responses to a parent questionnaire showed that only three-fourths of the parents of DISTAR pupils were aware of their participation in Title I. Nevertheless, 90 percent of them rated the activity as good or excellent and all felt the program should be continued. Overall, parental responses were very positive.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Because DISTAR served young pupils who were tested with several instruments, achievement assessment must be examined separately by test and age cycle. Gain scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) provided a measure of growth for age cycles eight and nine.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=205)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Precent with Standard Score gains	60%	60%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	62%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	Yes
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	68%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	9 mos.	Yes

As shown in Table 1, all objectives based on ITBS results were met by the activity as a whole. This was one of the very few activities that met all the objectives. Age cycle nine met all but one objective, which was especially noteworthy. These pupils were generally the very low achievers whom teachers felt could most profitably use an additional year in the primary grades, The ITBS data suggest that DISTAR successfully met their academic needs.

Seven schools served age cycles tested with the ITBS. The individual school's mean gain scores ranged from four months to 1.1 school years in reading comprehension and from five months to 1.3 school years in mathematics.

Chicago standard scores provide a measure of comparison with the total Chicago public school population. DISTAR's standard score means in reading comprehension converted to a percentile rank of 27 on the pretest and 37 on the posttest. This shift in percentile rank shows that this group of pupils improved significantly.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were administered to kindergarten and age cycle six pupils. Results were computed as standard scores based on a national mean of 50 and a standard deviation of about 21. Kindergarten pupils in DISTAR had a mean standard score of 45 in pre-reading and 52 in mathematics, showing they achieved scores in the average range nationwide. Looked at in another way, 39 percent of the kindergarten pupils scored above the national mean in reading and 57 percent did so in mathematics. These scores are almost as high as those achieved by the two Title I activities that enrolled only pupils who had had at least a year of preschool education.

Age cycle six pupils had a mean standard score of 43 in reading and 39 in mathematics. Thirty-seven percent scored above the national mean in reading and 39 percent in mathematics. The reading achievement was well above the Title I average for all activities.

Pupils in DISTAR have, for the past several years, made good achievement gains. The fiscal 1980 data appear to continue this trend. It should be added that implementation was not at the desired level in any year and so it can be surmised that, with a proper level of implementation by all teachers, gains could be much greater.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In fiscal 1980 the cost per pupil enrolled in DISTAR was about $989. This was more than $200 less per pupil than the cost of the Augmented Staffing activity which served the same ages, yet DISTAR had the advantage of providing vendor service and inservice, which teachers reported to be helpful in improving their classroom instruction.

DISTAR achievement test results for the past several years have consistently been above the average for all Title I activities, an unusual accomplishment for an activity enrolling only primary level pupils. Thus DISTAR would appear to be very cost-effective.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In fiscal 1980 the DISTAR vendor was attempting to find an inservice pattern that would provide for more successful implementation of the activity, so some experimental inservices were conducted and evaluated.

DISTAR provided a cost-effective self-contained option for 60 primary pupils. The number of pupils per teacher (20) and the assignment of a full-time aide who worked directly with pupils created a positive, productive atmosphere.

An unusually high percentage of parents of pupils in this activity attended conferences about their child's school progress, indicating a close involvement of home and school.

DISTAR's structured approach appeared to meet the needs of pupils who had previously failed to learn to read. The average pupil in DISTAR experienced a significant academic gain when compared to the average Chicago pupil. All ITBS achievement objectives were met.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Selection of appropriate teachers is essential to the success of DISTAR. The teacher selected must like a highly-structured approach and be willing to follow the plan of a scripted lesson each day, which is an integral part of DISTAR.

Kindergarten teachers should be encouraged to use the language development materials.

Pupils in primary grades who are perceived to need a structured, phonetic approach to reading or who have previously failed to make progress in reading should be selected.

DISTAR has been assessed as effective in meeting needs of Title I pupils of kindergarten and primary ages and is recommended to replace activities which have not been effective for these ages.

R&E #47
Project #569
Program #2475
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

EARLY INTERVENTION: A PRESCHOOL AND KINDERGARTEN ACTIVITY

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Early Intervention (EI) program had two components. Component I was designed to provide an intensive half-day readiness program for 40 children of age cycle four. Children participating in Component II were in the regular kindergarten and were given an additional half-day of readiness activities. A separate kindergarten room was required for implementation of the activity.

In fiscal 1980, it fourth year of operation, EI operated in 20 public schools serving 680 pupils. The staff consisted of 17 teachers and 17 teacher aides. Each class consisted of 20 pupils who participated for half day sessions. Five schools had preschool programs and fifteen schools chose the kindergarten option. Inservice was provided by the the district Title I coordinators with the assistance of Central Office staff.

EI provided readiness experiences which included language development, phonetic instruction, role playing and social vocabulary, visual-motor coordination, classification of objects, left-to-right eye movement, and writing skills. The Alphaphonics program could be used at the kindergarten or preschool level. Schools could also select additional instruction materials that met the pupils' needs.

Parents were encouraged to participate in the program during an equivalent of two days per month; in addition five parent conferences were conducted during the school year. Parents could borrow material for use at home to reinforce skills and concepts developed in the classroom.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

During the fall of fiscal 1980 the principals were interviewed to determine how they implemented and perceived the operation of EI. The interview sought answers to determine why EI was selected. Most principals indicated that the activity's instructional emphasis and methods best supplemented the needs of the pupils in their schools. There was a perceived need to provide a preschool-kindergarten program which focused on reading readiness. The majority of the principals felt that intensive instruction at this level would produce a better quality pupil for the future. A number of the principals found the program to have been effective in past years in their schools and in other schools as shown in evaluation reports.

Most principals did not experience problems related to program selection. All classes were implemented and operating, with staff and pupils selected, by October 1, 1979.

In the spring of fiscal 1980 the participating principals were asked to rate the program's effectiveness in the following areas: meeting objectives, staff, inservice, materials, equipment, and vendor service. EI was rated above average in all areas.

Staffing

The EI staff were qualified and experienced early childhood instructors. Some worked with the preschool children and others instructed children at the kindergarten level. The teacher aides had minimal experience working in the program. One aide was assigned in 1977 and the remaining aides began in 1979. Most teachers said that the activity became operational September 20, 1979.

Inservice

The Title I district coordinators provided three days of inservice training to new teachers and teacher aides and one day of inservice for staff continuing in the activity prior to the beginning of the instructional program. The topics covered in these inservices involved an introduction to the guidelines, information concerning the budget, materials and equipment, field trips, parent involvement, evaluation, vendor services, and the roles of the administrator and district coordinator. Most teachers and aides felt that the inservices had improved classroom instruction.

The school principals and program staff were asked to evaluate the inservices. The principals rated the inservices as above average. The teachers felt that the inservices provided by the district Title I coordinators, by central office staff, and the local inservices were very good. Those presented by the publisher's representatives were rated fair.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Observations of EI classes were conducted during the fall and spring of fiscal 1980. The observations centered on the interactions between teachers, teacher aides, and pupils. The instructional activities of the preschool and kindergarten participants focused on readiness to enter the regular school, according to an analysis of the observation records.

The predominant curricular emphasis was in the areas of readiness to read and to understand mathematics. Kindergarten pupils were frequently observed engaged in readiness activities which centered on language development, phonetic skills, number recognition, and proficiency in mastering the skills of addition and subtraction. The preschool pupils received instruction in fine motor skills designed to improve handwriting, use scissors and paste, and work with puzzles and instructional maipulatives.

The majority of the observed teachers worked more than 80 percent of the instructional time with the entire class. A small number of the observed teachers spent approximately 90 percent of their time working with small groups of pupils. Little individualized instruction was observed.

Most observed pupils were attentive. The attention level of the majority of the pupils was average; some were alert, motivated, and responsive to the tasks. A small number of the kindergarten participants were somewhat apathethic. A few preschool children were restless and occasionally completely off task.

An adequate amount of good quality materials were provided. The program materials were easily correlated with the Chicago CP/ML levels.

An experienced aide was assigned to each classroom. These aides provided daily group and individualized assistance with the learning tasks of the pupils. Each day the aide checked the pupils' written work, updated progress charts or other records and prepared instructional materials, bulletin boards or displays. The teacher aides also assisted the teachers as tutors, worked with small groups, supervised independent activities, checked and corrected the work of the children, and performed housekeeping tasks.

The aides regularly supervised the pupils outside of the classroom and assisted with minor behavior problems or with the pupils' personal needs. Outside duties never conflicted with the aides' Title I class schedules. Twice each month the aide supervised the pupils while the teacher conducted parent meetings.

There was a good working relationship between the teachers and aides. Most teacher aides felt that they had a sufficient amount of responsibilities. Their daily duties included working more than 50 percent of the time with pupils to provide group and individual assistance with learning tasks.

All teacher aides believed that the teacher provided clear directions regarding their duties and had sufficient confidence in their skills and abilities to allow them an adequate amount of responsibility. They also felt comfortable with the Title I teacher and able to discuss problems or to initiate new ideas which would benefit the children in the program.

A variety of instruction materials were in use in the classrooms. The predominant materials in use were worksheets and paper. Instruction charts, the chalkboard, crayons, pencils, puzzles and manipulatives were also a part of the instruction materials. Alphaphonics materials were in use at the kindergarten level.

Some parents were observed providing voluntary services as tutors, constructing games, making name cards and assisting during the snack period.

The physical atmosphere of most observed classrooms was conducive to learning. The classrooms were colorfully decorated with instructional charts, bulletin boards, children's work, and live plants. One room had an aquarium and a caged gerbil. Most rooms had a library and an art center.

The majority of the teachers said that they would like to teach in this activity next year. All felt that EI was very effective when compared to other Title I activities. The services of the SCR provided insight into the home situation of most pupils.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parent component of EI encouraged parental participation in the parent room at least two days per month and attendance at five conferences conducted during the school year.

Parent room activities included instruction and demonstrations in the use of educational materials at home with their children. Materials were provided on-loan for use at home to reinforce skills and concepts developed in the classroom.

An analysis of the responses of EI parents to a parent questionnaire indicated that they were aware that their children participated in a Title I program. Almost all parents had visited their children's classroom during the school year. The majority of the parents said that they had worked more this year with their children than last year. Participation in the program had increased their children's achievement level above that of last year, they felt. Parents indicated they would like to see the program continued next year.

Parent involvement at the school could have been better. Only 34 percent of the parents were active, cooperative, and interested and 42 percent were interested but not active in the activity. During the year an average of 23 out of a possible 40 parents came to school, either voluntarily or on request, to discuss the progress or problems concerning their children.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The Chicago EARLY Assessment was administered to preschool children (age cycles three and four) on a pre- and posttest basis. It gave teachers a systematic means of collecting information for educational planning. The instrument yielded a score in each of five skill areas: Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Language, Visual Discrimination, and Memory. Each score was translated into a percentile rank. Pretest information was used for grouping children according to their educational needs. As a general rule, children who scored below the thirtieth percentile in any of these areas were considered to be in need of special remediation.

Posttest information was used to measure the extent to which the activity was meeting the evaluation objective. The objective stated that 75 percent of the preschool pupils who scored below the thirtieth percentile in one or more areas of the pretest would achieve improved scores in those areas on the posttest. Table 1 demonstrates that this objective was met in all skill areas.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS-A) were administered to 271 kindergarten EI participants. The evaluation objective required 45 percent of the kindergarten pupils to exceed the 50th percentile in pre-reading for kindergarten pupils nationally. The results indicated that 34 percent attained reading scores above the 50th percentile and 36 percent attained math scores above the 50th percentile. The pupils did not meet the specified objective. Comparatively, only 40 percent of all Title I kindergarten pupils scored above the 50th percentile.

TABLE 1. CHICAGO EARLY ASSESSMENT (N=203)

	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Language	Visual Discrimination	Memory
A	94	128	81	110	113
B	49	67	37	55	54
C	90%	81%	92%	96%	91%

N = number with pretest in fall 1979
A = number scoring below thirtieth percentile on the pretest
B = number of those in line A who were posttested
C = percent of those in line B who achieved percentile gains

Pupils in this activity achieved mean standard scores that were in the average range in both reading and mathematics. Further analysis of the pre-reading data showed that 107 of the 271 five-year-olds scored at or above stanine 5. An analysis of the math socres revealed that 92 of the 205 five-year-olds scored at or above stanine 5.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

EI cost approximately $677,804 to serve 680 preschool and kindergarten pupils. The cost per pupil was $997. This cost was within the mid-range for all fiscal 1980 Title I activities and well below the other preschool activities. Achievement results indicated that EI met pupil needs as well as other activities serving the same ages. Thus EI appeared to be one of the most cost-effective Title I activities.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

EI was implemented by October 15, 1979. Activity selection was based on the need to provide a preschool-kindergarten program which focused on readiness to read. The staff was qualified and experienced. The principals rated the program's effectiveness as above average.

During the classroom observations most teachers were engaged in teaching the entire class subjects related to reading and math readiness. The pupils, in general, were attentive to task and exhibited interest in the instruction. The physical atmosphere of most classrooms was conducive to learning. Experienced aides provided daily group and individualized assistance with the learning tasks of the pupils. The working relationship between the teachers and aides was good.

Parent involvement in the classroom was greater than in most activities, but not sufficient to satisfy the EI objectives.

The principals, teachers, and teacher aides believed the inservices were good. The teachers felt the inservice presentations aided in the improvement of classroom instruction.

Data from the Chicago EARLY Assessment showed that pupils in age cycle four who scored below the 30th percentile when pretested attained improved scores when posttested.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Increase the amount of parent involvement in the activity, with emphasis on classroom participation.

EI should be considered for implementation at the kindergarten level at any Title I school with pupils who require the readiness skills necessary for successful entry into the first year of school after kindergarten.

R&E #78
Project #567
Program #7678
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Early Childhood Education (ECE) provided half-day sessions for children in age cycles three and four who were not enrolled in any other preschool program. In fiscal 1980, its seventh year of operation in Title I, ECE served 120 pupils in three public schools.

Each unit of ECE served 40 pupils and their parents, with one classroom teacher, one parent resource teacher and one teacher aide for each group of 40 children. The school day was divided into two half-day sessions with 20 pupils in attendance. An additional room was provided and furnished to meet the needs of the parent component. Materials and equipment were selected by the schools to best meet the needs of the pupils. The curriculum was to be focused on pre-reading activities and on developing positive attitudes in the pupils.

Parents were encouraged to participate in the ECE activity on at least two days a month. They received instruction in home arts, family living, and child development as well as information on ways to help their children at home. They were also given an opportunity to observe and assist in the classroom.

Inservice training for teachers and aides was provided by the district Title I coordinators with assistance from the central office staff.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

During the fall of fiscal 1980 the principals were interviewed to determine how they implemented and perceived the operation of Early Childhood Education in their schools.

The interview sought answers concerning the choice of this activity. The predominant response was that the activity's instructional emphasis and methods best supplemented the needs of the pupils in their schools.

There was a need to provide a preschool program which focused on reading readiness. All principals felt that early school intervention would hopefully prevent future school failure. One principal said the program had been effective in past years in the school. The program was also the choice of the parents.

The program had a qualified staff and a parent component. The principals did not experience problems related to program selection. All classes were implemented and operating, with staff and pupils selected, by October 15, 1979.

Staffing

The principal's assessment of the staff was below average. Information about staff changes was discovered by the evaluators during discussions with the classroom teachers. The changes occurred in two of the three ECE participating schools. These changes were initiated by the Personnel Department. The assistant principal of one school who had formerly been free to administrate was assigned to an ECE classroom. A teacher in the second school lost her position to a teacher with greater longevity. These changes caused some implementation problems. The assistant principal was frequently called upon to perform administrative duties. The ECE classroom was often left without a teacher. The newly assigned ECE teacher was without early childhood experience and therefore encountered some classroom management problems.

Inservice

The district coordinators assigned to ESEA Title I provided three days of inservice training to new teachers and teacher aides and one day of inservice for staff continuing in the activity prior to the beginning of the instructional program. The topics covered in these inservices involved an introduction to the guidelines, information concerning the budget, materials and equipment, field trips, parent involvement, evaluation, vendor services, and the roles of the administrator and district coordinator.

The school principals were asked to evaluate the inservices. They rated the inservices as above average.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Early Childhood Education observations were conducted during the fall and spring of fiscal 1980. The observations were centered on the interactions between the teachers, teacher aides, and the pupils. The focus of the observed activities were not instructional.

In one classroom, 30 percent of the teacher's instructional time involved the disciplining of pupils who were obstructive, restless, and daydreaming. Twenty percent of the time the teacher was engaged in housekeeping chores and the remaining fifty percent was utilized in discussion with an auditor.

The second observation also was non-instructional. The teacher was preparing to serve lunch. The aide supervised the replacement of play equipment and directed the children to the tables. Two parents helped the teacher set-up the tables. The transition from a play activity to eating lunch was disorganized and chaotic. The noise level was high. The observation time was 30 minutes.

The parent resource teacher was observed while guiding twelve children through a fashion show rehearsal. The pupils were attentive and motivated. The fashion show was conducted to raise funds for the activity. The classroom teacher (the assistant principal) was out of the classroom engaged in administrative duties. The parent resource teacher said the parents made the clothing as an activity. Several attractive garments which included dresses, skirts, blouses, pants, and shirts were on display in the parent room. Some parents pointed out the clothing that they had made.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parent component of the Early Childhood Education program encouraged parental participation in the parent room, at least two days per month. Parent room activities included instruction in home arts, family living, child development, and information concerning ways in which to help their children at home. They were also encouraged to observe and assist in the classroom.

Parental knowledge and attitudes concerning their children's participation in the ESEA Title I program was measured by their responses to a questionnaire. Analysis of these responses indicated all were aware of their children's participation in the ESEA program. All had visited their children's classroom teacher during the school year. Over 92 percent said that they had worked more with their children this year than last year. Most parents felt participation in the program had increased their children's achievement level above that of the previous year. Parents believed the achievement levels of their children would have diminished without participation in the Early Childhood Education program.

A large percentage of the parents assisted their children daily with homework. Those who did not work daily with their children did so weekly. The parents rated the program as excellent (60 percent), good (33 percent), and fair (7 percent). All parents felt that the program should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The Chicago EARLY Assessment was administered to preschool children (age cycles three and four) on a pre- and posttest basis. The purpose of the Chicago EARLY Assessment was to give teachers a systematic means of collecting information for eductional planning. The instrument yielded a score in each of five skill areas. These were Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Language, Visual Discrimination, and Memory. Each score was translated into a percentile rank. Pretest information was used for grouping children according to their educational needs. As a general rule, children who scored below the 30th percentile in any of these areas were considered to be in need of remediation.

Posttest information was used to measure the extent to which the activity was meeting the specified objective. This objective required 75 percent of the preschool pupils who scored below the 30th percentile in one or more areas of the pretest to achieve improved scores in those areas on the posttest. Table 1 shows that this objective was met in all areas except memory.

TABLE 1. CHICAGO EARLY ASSESSMENT (N=116)

	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Language	Visual Discrimination	Memory
A:	44	60	36	39	35
B:	26	38	15	21	12
C:	81%	82%	93%	86%	50%

N = number who had pretests in fall 1979
A = number scoring below thirtieth percentile on the pretest
B = number of those in line A who were posttested
C = percent of those in line B who achieved percentile gains

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The Early Childhood Education program cost approximately $242,912 to serve 120 preschool pupils. The cost per pupil was $2,024. The cost of this program exceeded that of any other fiscal 1980 preschool program.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

The ECE program was implemented by October 15, 1979. Program selection was based on the need for early school intervention in order to prevent future failure and on parent requests.

The observed classrooms were engaged in non-instructional activities. Classroom management was poor. Excessive time was spent on the lunch period.

The program's implementation was negatively effected by staff changes.

Parents expressed knowledge of the ESEA program in which their children participated. All parents visited their children's classroom teacher. Most parents gave the program an excellent rating.

The principal ranked the inservices as above average.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This Title I activity has been assessed as being capable of meeting the needs of the local school Title I participants in isolated situations. If a more effective activity is available, which is consistent with local school needs, replacement is recommended.

R&E #65
Project #564
Program #7665
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM SCHOOLS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Instructional Team Schools (ITS), in its seventh year as a Title I activity in fiscal 1980, operated in 13 public schools with 16 teams servicing 1,450 primary, 504 intermediate, and 456 upper level pupils. This activity was designed to provide an instructional team to develop a curriculum that features flexibility in scheduling, in grouping patterns, and in the use of instructional strategies for 145 pupils at the primary level and 160 pupils at the intermediate or upper levels. Each team would consist of six teachers, one of whom would assume the responsibility of team leader, four teacher aides, and three volunteer parent aides.

The instructional organization created by the teachers was expected to be flexible. The team could group and regroup pupils according to their abilities, achievements, and interests; they could also establish a time schedule shorter or longer than the regular 30 or 40 minute periods and provide instruction in small groups, in large groups and in independent studies. Teaching methods and materials were to vary depending upon their appropriateness, the instructional needs of pupils, and groupings for instruction.

Because planning is vital in team teaching, Title I was to fund two additional hours per week for this purpose. Schools were to provide space to accommodate small and large groups of instruction as well as additional space for the team to plan and organize materials.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

Interviews conducted with principals indicated that many of the schools selecting ITS appear to have done so for several reasons. First, the activity's instructional emphasis and methods were considered to be the best means for supplementing the needs of pupils in the school. Second, ITS was seen as a means of obtaining additional staff. Third, in some instances, the activity had been effective at the school in previous years. Although there were delays in the delivery of materials and needed supplies, instruction seems to have been initiated on time in nearly all the schools. Teachers reported having begun the actual work of teaching by the 15th of September.

Staffing

The assignment of teachers was accomplished without major problems. The assignment of other team members, however, encountered some difficulties. A number of schools complained of teacher aides being assigned late. In addition, some schools seem to have experienced difficulties in the recruitment and retention of parent volunteers. This condition was exacerbated later during the year by delayed stipends for parent volunteers, sometimes for as long as several months.

The quality of teachers assigned to ITS was reported to have been high. All principals who completed the Principal's Evaluation Form assigned a rating of 3 (the highest rating) to indicate the quality of teachers in the activity. Of the 43 teachers who completed the Teacher Questionnaire, many reported being in their first year of Title I. Over 76 percent of the teacher aides were in their first year of Title I work experience.

Inservice Training

In order to facilitate operation of ITS and to enhance its effectiveness, an inservice training program was provided for all staff personnel involved with the activity. These inservices were sponsored by the Department of Government Funded Programs through the citywide coordinator of the activity. Additional inservice arrangements were in operation at each school where teachers were scheduled to spend an average of two hours per week primarily for planning purposes. Consultations with local school administration and with the Title I coordinator were an additional feature of the inservice training program. Thirty-nine teachers and 33 teacher aides reported attending an average of two inservice meetings. Fifteen teachers reported an average of three locally arranged meetings by the school administration. Over 70 percent and up to 90 percent of all modes of inservice training arrangements were considered to have been either good or very good by both teachers and teacher aides.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

An analysis of records related to classroom observations indicated that a total of 60 activity classes were visited to obtain a comprehensive and detailed picture of the prevailing classroom environment in ITS. The most important findings are discussed below.

Organization

The facility used for ITS was a regular classroom in 96 percent of all observations; only in 4 percent was there a departure from the general rule. The single class per room (or space) arrangement appeared to be the most predominant organization structure of this activity.

Of the 60 classrooms visited, the teacher was present with the class in 84 percent of the cases. The teacher was absent from the school in five percent of the observations. Two percent of the teachers were assigned to substitute for other teachers at the time evaluators visited the schools and two percent were on field trips with their classes. The proportion of teachers with duties unaccounted for amounted to seven percent of all observations.

In the instances where the teacher was absent from school, the evidence indicated that the customary thing to do was to cancel the class (87 percent of the time) and probably redistribute the pupils among the other classes of the team. A substitute teacher was provided thirteen percent of the time.

Teacher aides were assigned to the teams in 88 percent of the observations. In 12 percent of the observed cases the teacher aide's position had not yet been filled. Among the classes observed, 58 percent had a full-time teacher aide assigned, and 30 percent shared an aide's time with another class. Where teacher aides were assigned, evaluators found the aide absent from school in 14 percent of the observations and in another 14 percent the aide was in another room. Instances where the aide was assigned duties outside the classroom were limited to six percent.

Implementation of Instruction

The extent to which the activity was fully implemented appears to have been 60 percent of all observations. In 40 percent of the on-site observations it was found that some features of the instructional machinery had yet to be in place. The curricula area found to dominate a good proportion (44 percent) of the observations was reading. Language arts, as a subject, was emphasized 24 percent of the time. Other curricular areas of emphasis were found to be mathematics (15 percent) and miscellaneous topics (9 percent). Eight percent of instruction was spent on transition activities. For the purpose of comparison, the average self-contained Title I activity seemed to spend a little less time on reading exercises or on miscellaneous topics but spent a little more time on language arts and mathematics than was true of ITS. Time on transition activities was limited to six percent in self-contained activities in general.

Classroom Management

Within the activity classrooms, the common arrangement of pupils for instruction purposes was the whole class group pattern for 46 percent of the observations and partial-class group patterns for 13 percent of the observations. The independent group task technique was observed in 26 percent of all cases. Pupils were assigned individual tasks eight percent of the time. Seven percent of the cases were observed to be transition arrangements.

In contrast, Title I self-contained activities in general were observed to utilize the whole-class group technique in 31 percent of the observations and the partial class one-fourth (25 percent) of the observations. The independent group task or the individual pupil task methods were a little more frequent in self-contained activities in general than they were in ITS.

The activities of the ITS teachers included instructing whole class (33 percent), partial class (28 percent), supervising (20 percent), working with individual pupils (8 percent), marking papers (5 percent), disciplining (4 percent), and housekeeping (2 percent). By comparison, the activities of teachers in all Title I self-contained classes were in a slightly different order. For instance, teachers in the self-contained activities spent more time (40 percent) instructing partial classes than time spent teaching the whole class (23 percent). For these teachers, additional tasks included supervising (17 percent), working with individual pupils (9 percent), marking papers (4 percent), housekeeping (4 percent), and disciplining pupils (2 percent).

In ITS, teacher remarks were generally neutral in affective tone in 60 percent of all observations; in 21 percent no remarks were made. Positive remarks were made during 13 percent of the observations; the tone of the remarks could not be determined in four percent of all observations. In two percent of the observations the teacher remarks were negative. The percentage distribution of teacher remarks was comparable to that of teachers in self-contained activities in general.

The role of the teacher aide included marking papers (23 percent), supervising tasks (19 percent), instructing individual pupils (percent), instructing groups (3 percent), and housekeeping (3 percent). The aide was observed to be in transition activities in 40 percent of the observations and out of the room in four percent.

Materials

The materials used in the ITS activity frequently included workbooks and worksheets (31 percent), textbook (20 percent), chalkboard and charts (9 percent), miscellaneous (8 percent), writing materials (5 percent), manipulatives (2 percent), and learning kits (1 percent). In 24 percent of the observations no materials were in use. By comparison, the percentage distribution of materials used in self-contained activities generally was: workbook (27 percent), chalk-board and charts (18 percent), textbook (17 percent), miscellaneous (6 percent), manipulatives (2 percent), writing materials (1 percent), learning kits (1 percent), and hardware (1 percent). The percentage of observations where no materials were in use was 27 percent.

Pupil Involvement

The activities of pupils in ITS classrooms included seat work exercises (46 percent), listening and watching (31 percent), supplemental learning activities (10 percent), silent reading (6 percent), recitation (5 percent), and other activities (2 percent). Their level of involvement was working on tasks in 78 percent of all observations. In a little over one-fifth of the observations, pupils were observed to be off task (14 percent), waiting for assignment (5 percent), out of the room (2 percent), and undeterminable (1 percent). This picture of pupils' level of involvement is comparable to that of pupils in self-contained activities in general.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

A Parent Questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of parents of Title I pupils to measure the extent of their involvement in Title I activities. Twenty-four of those who returned the questionnaires responded to items dealing with the ITS. Eighty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they had visited the activity classrooms. Eighty-two percent worked with their child at home and 83 percent believed their child had achieved more in school in fiscal 1980 than in previous years. On the question of whether the activity should be continued, 86 percent were favorable to the idea. In view of this evidence, the objective expecting 65 percent of the parents to visit their children's teachers appears to have been attained. However, the 90 percent expectancy level for the parents to be aware of their child's participation in the activity was not met. Thus only one of the two parent involvement objectives was met.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Reading Comprehension

Table 1 provides information on the extent to which ITS was effective in meeting the Title I reading objectives. The table provides information on pupils who were tested with the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. Scores are presented only for pupils who took the May 1979 and May 1980 tests. An asterisk indicates the relevant objective was met. More complete achievement data appears in Volume 2 of this report.

For each age cycle, except for the seven-year-olds, the number of pupils with matched scores as shown in the table represents no less than 70 percent of the pupils who were reported enrolled in the activity and more than 90 percent of pupils who reported posttest results. In the case of the seven-year-olds, the number of pupils shown is a little less than one-fourth of the activity enrollment at that age level and represents only those pupils who were able to take the ITBS the previous year as a pretest. For this age level, therefore, the number shown may not be representative of all the seven-year-olds in the activity.

ITS appears to have been effective in improving the reading comprehension skills of pupils at the upper age cycles, 12, 13, and 14. The 12-year-olds improved their position on the Chicago achievement distribution from a pretest standard score mean of 239 to a posttest mean of 243. Since the citywide mean is approximately 250, this places the 12-year-olds in the average category in the citywide distribution. Sixty percent of this age group made sufficient reading improvement to attain a standard score gain between the pre-and posttests, thereby meeting the criteria for the standard score reading objective. In terms of grade equivalents, Table 1 indicates that the twelve-year-olds grade equivalent gain was 10 months, satisfying the reading comprehension grade-equivalent objective. The 13- and 14-year-olds exceeded the 60 percent criteria for the standard score objective as well as the 8 months criterion for the grade-equivalent objective.

TABLE 1. READING COMPREHENSION RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score gains	Grade-equivalent gains
7	91	249	249	45	.9*
8	398	237	237	48	.6
9	228	230	235	58	.7
10	172	235	235	48	.5
11	130	233	235	56	.6
12	182	239	243	60*	1.0*
13	177	239	245	64*	1.3*
14	110	232	240	76*	1.4*

For age cycles 8 through 11, the ITS activity did not appear to be an effective approach for improving these pupils' reading comprehension. For these age cycles, none met the 60 percent standard score objective or the eight months reading objective. For the seven-year-olds, the evidence available is insufficient to draw any conclusions.

Vocabulary

Table 2 provides information on the extent to which ITS was effective in improving vocabulary knowledge among Title I pupils. It indicates that older pupils in the activity, in general, appear to have done better than the younger pupils. Sixty-eight percent of the 13-year-olds attained a standard score gain. In terms of grade-equivalents, this group gained 14 months on the average. Sixty-six percent of the 14-year-olds attained a standard score gain and their vocabulary gain for the year was 19 grade-equivalent months. Both age cycles exceeded both objectives.

TABLE 2. VOCABULARY RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score gains	Grade-equivalent gains
7	95	244	253	69*	1.1*
8	404	240	240	48	.6
9	229	233	236	55	.6
10	172	237	237	46	.4
11	130	237	237	43	.4
12	182	240	241	47	.7
13	174	239	247	68*	1.4*
14	109	232	245	66*	1.9*

The performance of pupils in age cycles 8 through 12 was below the levels specified in the objectives. None of these groups attained the criteria for meeting the two principal cognitive objectives. In the case of the seven-year-olds, the information available was insufficient to make any inference regarding the group's level of performance in the activity. For younger age levels, in general, the effectiveness of the activity seems to be questionable.

Reading Readiness

For pupils in the first year of school beyond kindergarten, the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were administered to assess the achievement of pupils of that age cycle participating in ITS. Test results for 121 pupils, or roughly one-third of all participants of that age cycle in the activity, were received and analyzed to determine program effects. The results, provided in Volume 2, show that 23 percent of the group exceeded the national median in reading. Since the proportion of pupils exceeding the national median was less than the desired level (40 percent), the CTBS reading readiness objective was not achieved. However, that few pupils attained the national median may not be an adverse reflection on the activity; rather, it may be a function of the initial position of the pupils at the onset of the activity.

Mathematics Readiness Skills

The analysis of the mathematics portion for the 121 six-year-olds who took the CTBS indicates that 25 percent of the group exceeded the national median in mathematics. Although the proportion of pupils exceeding the national median was a little higher than that of pupils who exceeded such a level in reading, still the 40 percent level was not attained and the mathematics objective for the six year olds was not achieved. Again, this may not be a reflection on the activity.

Mathematics

For pupils in age cycles 7 through 14, the goal of the ITS activity was to improve mathematics competency by at least 8 months. Further, the objective specified that 60 percent of the pupils would achieve a standard score gain in mathematics. Table 3 provides information on the extent to which these objectives were met as measured by the ITBS.

TABLE 3. MATHEMATICS RESULTS BY AGE CYCLE

Age Cycle	Number of Pupils	Pretest Standard Score	Posttest Standard Score	% Having Standard Score gains	Grade-equivalent gains
7	90	242	249	70*	.8*
8	391	239	241	56	.7
9	227	235	238	61*	.7
10	170	240	239	42	.5
11	128	237	237	54	.7
12	182	238	240	57	.9*
13	167	237	242	72*	1.1*
14	102	230	238	72*	1.3*

Table 3 indicates that the effectiveness of the ITS project was not the same for pupils of the various age cycles. The evidence does seem to suggest that the only pupils who profited in a significant way from participation in the activity were some of the nine year olds, and some of the 12- through 14-year-olds. Since the seven-year-olds shown in the table include only those pupils who were able to take the pretest the previous year, and may therefore not represent the activity's enrollment at that age level, no conclusion can be drawn regarding the effectiveness of the activity for this age group.

Sixty-one percent of the 9-year-olds attained a standard score gain, thereby meeting the criteria for the standard score objective. The group's grade-equivalent gain, however, was only seven months. In view of this, the objective expecting an eight-month gain in mathematics appears not to have been achieved by pupils of age cycle 9.

The 13- and 14-year-olds in the activity achieved both the standard score and the eight months grade equivalent objectives. Seventy-two percent of the 13- and 14-year olds achieved a standard score gain. In terms of grade-equivalent scores, the 13-year-olds gained an average of 11 months and the 14-year-olds gained an average of 13 months. With respect to pupils in age cycles 8, 10, and 11, the growth in mathematics failed to meet the criteria for either the standard score or the grade-equivalent objective. Thus for these pupils, the ITS activity does not seem to have been an appropriate instructional program.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evidence analyzed by this report indicates that the Instructional Team Schools activity was implemented on time in nearly all schools. There were no major problems with the assignment of teachers. There were, however, some instances where the assignment of teacher aides was behind schedule; also, the recruitment and retention of parent volunteers appears to have presented some problems. The majority of classes appear to have had sufficient quantities of textbooks, materials, and supplies necessary for the operation of the activity. However, a few classrooms, perhaps due to late deliveries, did not seem to be adequately supplied.

Pupils in activity classes for the most part were actively involved in the learning tasks assigned to them.

The major strength of the ITS seems to lie primarily in the potential of the idea. If there is any validity to the old adage that two heads are better than one, then certainly the thirteen heads comprising each team should offer the best promise to Title I pupils.

However, at the operational level, a number of factors seem to militate against implementation of a true team-teaching program. First, the facilities in most schools were not designed to accommodate a program requiring flexibility in the use of space and equipment. Second, the frequent transfer of teachers and teacher aides from program to program or from one school to another interfered with the inservice program resulting in a situation where a significant proportion of the teachers were unfamiliar with the activity's methodologies and procedures. Third, since many of the staff personnel in the activity were assigned randomly, without consideration of their philosophical orientation or choice of activity, it was not always possible to form teams that functioned in a cohesive manner.

Probably due to the difficulties preventing successful implementation of a true team-teaching program, the effectiveness of ITS has been limited so far. For the four years prior to fiscal 1980, the activity consistently was in the bottom quartile of all Title I activities with respect to pupils' gains on standardized tests. In fiscal 1980, low gain scores occurred again for many of the pupils, except those in the uppermost age cycles. In view of this poor history of performance, and the high operation costs, it is recommended that this activity be significantly curtailed and limited to a few schools until successful implementation procedures are identified and the extent of the effectiveness of team teaching is established.

R&E #45
Project #617
Program #7645
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

CHILD-PARENT CENTERS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980, the fourteenth year of its operation in Title I, the Child-Parent Centers (CPC) served 4,658 children in twenty-five centers. Half-day classes were held for an average membership of 17 pupils per class. Twenty centers served age cycles three through five and five centers were for preschool pupils only. Special activities for preschool and kindergarten children to accelerate reading readiness and academic success were provided by the CPCs. Audiovisual equipment and culturally oriented materials, geared to the pupil's level, were used in each of the centers. Approaches and materials for instruction were selected and developed by the local staff in cooperation with the parent advisory council. Parents, or a parent surrogate, were required to spend the equivalent of two days a month at the center because parent participation was an integral part of the activity.

The centers were administered by the principal of the parent school. A freed head teacher position was provided at each center. In addition to the head teacher, each center was assigned one teacher and one teacher aide for each class, a parent-resource teacher, a school community representative (SCR), a school clerk, and a janitor. The centers also shared the services of speech therapists and school nurses. There were 118.5 CPC classroom teachers and 137 aides paid for by Title I in fiscal 1980.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Most CPCs implemented instruction promptly. However, at one CPC instruction was not observed to have begun until after Thanksgiving.

Pupil Selection

Pre-registration was conducted in May and June of 1979 for three- and four-year-old CPC applicants. Participation in the CPC program was based on the age of the child;

residence in the attendance area; no previous preschool attendance; and the parent's agreement to participate in the parent component. Eligibility and was established through an evaluation of the information given in the ESEA Title I Preschool Entry Assessment Application. This instrument sought data concerning the family background, the child's developmental history, health history, and social development. The CPC parents were also asked several specific questions related to the activity: Who told you of this program? What do you expect from the CPC program? How much time per week can you devote to the Child-Parent Center?

One CPC had great difficulties in finding enough pupils for full implementation. This was the exception as most CPCs maintained lengthly waiting lists.

Staffing

There were many personnel changes in the CPCs in fiscal 1980. Experienced early childhood education teachers were transferred and replaced by teachers without early childhood training. This training is not a requirement for CPC teachers but is very desirable.

Three head teachers were new in fiscal 1980. One had been a CPC parent-resource teacher the previous year. One CPC was without an assigned head teacher as late as January 1980. Many CPCs began instruction with aide vacancies. On the other hand, several teachers responding to a questionnaire said they had worked in the CPCs for 11 of the 14 years of their existence.

Inservice

At the request of the administrator, the coordinator assigned to the CPC activity assisted in planning inservices on techniques and materials pertinent to the staff involved in the instructional program.

Prior to program implementation a series of on-site inservices were conducted for new and continuing teachers and teacher aides by the head teacher. The topics covered during the inservices involved an introduction to or review of the activity's guidelines, the budget, material and equipment availability, the instruction program, the parent component, the availability of supportive services, field trips, the evaluation of the program, and the role of the administration and district coordinators.

Approximately two inservices were provided for the head teachers which concerned the day-to-day management, a review of and possible solutions to management problems, any impending budget cuts, and an evaluation of the center's objectives and possible outcomes.

The CPC clerks were recipients of two inservices during the year. These inservices provided information related to the responsibilities, procedures, and expedition of all forms, such as requisitions, purchase orders, and invoices required for the successful operation of the centers.

Three to four inservices were conducted during the year for the SCRs attached to the centers. The discussions centered on the maintenance of accurate records of services rendered, the provision of services, and any problems encountered in the process.

Parent workshops and inservices were provided at the request of the head teachers. The inservices were used as assessment tools to determine the viability of the parent component. The coordinator arranged for presentations by resource persons in the areas of child development, city services, and social agencies.

A culminating inservice was conducted for all staff at the end of the school year. The subjects covered were an assessment of the professional growth of the staff, sharing new sources and uses of materials, an evaluation of the program objectives and goals, and plans for the coming year.

The principals evaluated the overall quality of the inservices as effective. The teachers' assessment of the presentors and the quality of the inservices was very good for central office and local school staff and good for district Title I staff and the vendors.

The majority (90 percent) of the teachers believed the inservices, in general, contributed to the improvement of classroom instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

During the fall and spring of fiscal 1980 as part of the evaluation process, CPC classrooms were observed. The focus of the observations was the instructional interaction between the teacher, teacher aide, and pupils.

In most observed classrooms the children were engaged in language arts activities such as: "Show and Tell," story dramatization, speaking through puppets, small reading groups which required the pupils to respond in clearly spoken sentences to the teacher's question, rhyme recitations, and group singing. Small groups of children were seen working on math projects such as: number and shape recognition, concrete counting, rote counting, writing, and tracing numbers. Some independent work activities involved the use of worksheets, workbooks, and paper. The predominant curricular emphasis was language development and basic skill needs but there were great differences in emphasis between centers.

The Child-Parent Centers had an adequate amount of materials, supplies, and equipment. Many teachers reported materials arriving later in fiscal 1980 than usual. Among the materials frequently seen in use in addition to common classroom supplies were manipulatives, puzzles, educational charts, large toys, paints, filmstrip machines, record players, and movie projectors. The majority of the teachers felt that the quality and quantity of the instructional materials met with their approval.

Each CPC classroom had an aide who provided daily group and individual assistance with learning tasks. The majority of the responding teachers said the aide was never required to perform duties which conflicted with the Title I class schedule.

Most of the observed teachers were engaged in the instruction of either the entire class or a small group of pupils. A sizeable number of teachers were seen supervising the children engaged in independent activities. The teachers were generally supportive as they moved among the pupils commenting on the work, answering questions, or encouraging attention to task. The activities of a small number of teachers involved record keeping, housekeeping, making preparations for the instruction of a new lesson, or changing from one activity to another. In a few instances, it was observed that the teachers were keeping records while the aides instructed, a reversal of the usual procedure.

At many CPCs little time was spent on discipline problems because most pupils were attentive to task and distractions were few. On the other hand, on-site observations at a few CPCs found teachers and aides spending considerable time disciplining pupils. A small number of pupils who were restless and not attentive to the ongoing instruction were frequently observed. This behavior is often characteristic of preschoolers. It is not unusual to see preschool children talk to themselves as they work. Spontaneous verbal expressions made to neighbors are also common actions. These behavior patterns often create a noisy atmosphere which could be interpretated as a problem to the uninitiated.

The variety of materials used in the activity, good classroom management, and an effort by the teacher to meet the needs of the pupils created a positive learning

244

environment. Most observed pupils were motivated and responsive to the instruction.

The physical atmosphere of most classrooms was conducive to learning. They were neat, attractively decorated with bulletin boards, instructional charts, and the children's best "papers", and art work. One center had the children's work on display outside each classroom. There were a few disorganized classrooms and the appearance of some teachers' desks was cluttered.

The lessons appeared to be challenging and adapted to the level of the pupils' readiness. Many teachers encouraged input from the pupils through questions and requests to perform tasks at their ability levels. The teachers' delivery of assignments, directions, and answers to questions were clear and intelligible. The demeanor of some teachers was effective, firm, fair, and friendly. It was not unusual to see teachers and teacher aides embrace the children.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

A commitment to participate was made by the parent before the child was accepted into the CPC program. The involvement of the parents in the education of their children was considered an important factor in the CPC program. A parent or surrogate was asked to spend the equivalent of two days per month at the center. If this requirement was not met the principals at their discretion could drop the pupil from the activity.

The parent-resource teacher worked with parents in home arts, family living, child development, and general educational development. The parent-resource teacher also provided the parents with the necessary skills and materials needed to reinforce the child's school learning experiences at home.

Parents were requested to complete a questionnaire indicating the degree of adherence to the parent component guidelines. An analysis of the parents' responses indicated that over 80 percent were aware of their children's participation in a Title I funded activity. Almost all parents had visited their children's classrooms during the year. Over half of the responding parents said they assisted their children at home daily with homework assignments. More than 90 percent indicated that they had worked with their children more in fiscal 1980 than in the previous year. Almost all parents believed that they had guided their children to use their leisure time productively. A majority of the parents felt that participation in the CPC program was instrumental in the improved achievement levels of their children and all would like to see the program continued.

Responses by some teachers to a questionnaire revealed that the number of parents who came to school voluntarily or on request to discuss a child's progress or problems was quite high (an average of 29 parents per teacher). Teachers also estimated that approximately 54 percent of the parents actively exhibited interest in the CPC program; another 32 parents were considered to be interested but not active.

Evaluators discovered during discussions with classroom teachers that there was a need for more parent-teacher communication concerning pupil progress and skill needs. One principal felt that the absence of parental knowledge concerning the pupils' progress could create future academic problems for the child, especially at the kindergarten level. He believed that early parental awareness of academic problems and prompt action would prevent failure. CPCs were designed specifically to counteract such unawareness.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The Chicago EARLY Assessment was administered to preschool children on a pre- and posttest basis. The purpose of the Chicago EARLY Assessment was to give teachers a systematic means of collecting information for educational planning. The instrument yielded a score in each of five skill areas. These were Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Language, Visual Discrimination, and Memory. Each score was translated into a percentile rank. Pretest information was used for grouping children according to their educational needs. As a general rule, children who scored below the 30th percentile in any of these areas were considered to be in need of special remediation.

Posttest information was used to measure the extent to which the activity was meeting the specified objective. This objective required 75 percent of the preschool pupils who scored below the 30th percentile in one or more areas of the pretest to achieve improved scores in those areas on the posttest. The objective was met in all areas.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS-A) was administered to 794 kindergarten level CPC pupils to measure the cognitive effect of participation in the program. Fifty-four percent of the participating five-year-olds tested exceeded the national norm for the test. The objective requiring that at least 45 percent of the kindergarten pupils exceed the fiftieth percentile nationally in reading was met. The average for CPC participants was also higher on the CTBS than for all five-year-old Title I participants.

TABLE 1. CHICAGO EARLY ASSESSMENT (N=3359)

	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Language	Visual Discrimination	Memory
A:	1288	1142	1142	1454	1125
B:	713	1009	612	842	952
C:	86%	84%	94%	91%	91%

N = number who had pretests in fall, 1979
A = number scoring below thirtieth percentile on the pretest
B = number of those in line A who were posttested
C = percent of those in line B who achieved percentile gains

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The CPC program cost approximately $8,559,102 to serve 4,658 preschool pupils in fiscal 1980. The cost per pupil was $1,838.

This stated expenditure of funds was warranted based upon the end result. The goal of the CPC program was to provide an early educational intervention for the preschool child. The program built a strong cognitive and affective foundation, which should help prevent future school failure. The Chicago EARLY Assessment and CTBS data indicated that most CPC participants should enter the regular school environment prepared to meet the challenge.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The 25 Child-Parent Centers were implemented by September 4, 1979. Pre-registration of three- and four-year-old CPC applicants was conducted in May and June. The completion, by parents, of the ESEA Title I Preschool Entry Assessment Application established pupil eligibility. The CPC staff was experienced, stable, and very effective for the most part.

The overall inservices were adequate, providing effective information to all staff members.

Most parents indicated a degree of knowledge concerning their role in the guidance and education of their children. They expressed a desire to see the program continue next year, because participation in the program was instrumental in the improved achievement levels of their children. Some teachers and principals felt that there should be an increase in teacher-parent communication relative to pupils' academic deficiencies.

The instructional activities were adequate and appeared to meet the needs of the children. The CPCs had an ample amount of materials, supplies, and equipment. Each classroom had the services of a teacher aide who provided daily group and individual assistance with learning tasks. The physical atmosphere of most classrooms was conducive to learning.

The Chicago EARLY Assessment results provided teachers with information necessary for grouping the children according to their educational needs in the five skill areas. Based upon the results of the EARLY more than the expected 75 percent of the participants met the activity objective in all skill areas. CTBS data also indicated that the program was effective. Fifty-four percent of the five-year-olds tested exceeded national norms. Based upon these findings most CPC pupils should enter the regular school environment prepared to meet the challenge. The expenditures for operation of the CPC program was justified based upon the participants' achievement results.

An in-depth study of CPCs will be conducted in the fall of 1981.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This Title I activity has been assessed as one of the most effective for Title I pupils. It is recommended that components of this activity be considered for adoption elsewhere in the Chicago schools.

Procedures should be developed and implemented to increase parent-teacher communication relative to pupils' academic deficiencies.

It is recommended that teacher requirements include training in early childhood education.

R&E #37
Project #606
Program #7637
Evaluator: Jeanelle Jennings

FOLLOW THROUGH

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Jointly funded by ESEA Title I and the Economic Opportunity Act with support from the Chicago Board of Education, the purpose of the Follow Through (FT) activity is to sustain the gains made by pupils participating in Head Start or other comparable pre-school programs. Pupils served by this activity are those considered to be economically and educationally deprived and who are eligible for kindergarten enrollment. Once enrolled, however, the pupils continue in FT through their third year beyond kindergarten. The activity is designed to meet the physical, psychological, and instructional needs of children in a comprehensive program that integrates school and community resources.

In fiscal 1980, its 13th year in the Chicago Title I program, FT served approximately 1,400 primary level pupils in six participating schools. Staffing patterns differed in the participating schools but each class of 25 to 31 pupils received the services of a teacher, school aide or teacher aide, school nurse, school-community representative, and master teacher.

FT has two instructional approaches: the Cultural Linguistic Approach which emphasizes oral language instruction in nongraded, individualized, heterogeneous groups and multi-level classrooms which permit each child to explore freely and to progress at his/her own speed; and the Cognitively Oriented Approach which is based upon Piaget's theory of child development, which contends that cognitive structure develops spontaneously as a result of the child's interactions with objects and people.

Parents were to participate in special interest groups, instructional model workshops, inservice demonstrations, and child-parent centered activities which were planned and executed by local steering committees and Policy Advisory Committees.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

During the fall of fiscal 1980 principals were interviewed to determine how they implemented and perceived the operation of the FT activity in their schools. The program was implemented without difficulty by October 15, 1979, at the six participating schools.

The principals believed that FT provided some positive services to participants. The self-contained classrooms provided personal contact with teachers. As graduates of Head Start, many children came into FT with a good pre-school background.

Pupil Selection

All Head Start graduates were accepted into the program because the activity reinforced and ensured continuity of previous instruction. Unfortunately, there were not enough Head Start children to populate all kindergarten classrooms. Some principals therefore made the FT program available to kindergarten pupils with specific skill needs. In several of the schools all the primary level classrooms were FT which led to some transfer pupils without prior FT experience being placed in the activity. Pupils with scholastic deficiencies were sometimes also placed in FT classes. The selection criteria used were CP/ML levels, ITBS scores, and teacher recommendations.

Staffing

In fiscal 1980 there were few personnel changes in FT. Only one principal experienced any staffing problems, expressing concern at the shortage of qualified teachers. This response probably referred to poor individual teacher performance, rather than a shortage of teachers. Another principal, said that the staff was very effective.

Inservice Training

Inservice training was provided for the FT staff by central office staff, Title I district coordinators, and the model sponsor.

High/Scope Educational Research Foundation furnished the following inservice training in the Cognitively Oriented Approach for Howland and Lathrop schools:

> a one-week, on-site implementation workshop for teachers, paraprofessionals, curriculum assistants, and central office staff members;
>
> the on-site services of a field consultant one week per month and a training workshop in Ypsilanti, Michigan;

a planning and evaluation workshop in Fort Walton Beach, Florida to evaluate the current programs and suggest revisions;

assistance in planning for an on-site workshop and production of curriculum materials.

The Center for Inner City Studies of Northeastern Illinois University provided inservice training in the Cultural Linguistic Approach for Brown, Fuller, Jenner, and Price schools including:

an orientation workshop in Chicago;

on-site visits by Center staff, conducted five times per year for one week;

implementation of a program for teacher aides as related to the sponsor's model program;

instruction in the use of guidelines in language development, mathematics, and social studies;

planning evaluation of pupils' progress, teacher and teacher aide participation, and parental involvement as agreed upon with local activity staff.

The principals rated the FT inservices as very effective. During the Cultural Linguistic orientation inservice workshop, several critical comments concerning the activity were made by some teachers.

An inservice workshop held at the Center for Inner City Studies was observed. It was conducted by the FT coordinator, the Cultural Linguistics director, and assistant director. The participants were teachers, teacher aides, parents, and a youth worker. The participants were actively involved in the workshop. They contributed through participation and provided constructive criticisms. Some expressed dissatisfaction with the program.

The agenda included a variety of subjects. A discussion of the background and future plans for FT was informative. A report from the U.S. Office of Education focused on a tentative plan for the future. Emphasis would be placed on management by objectives. Suggestions were offered to keep the FT committees in each of the six schools active. There was a special presentation, Setting the Mood for Learning, by the FT consultant from Northeastern Illinois University.

The teachers made numerous critical comments including:

- -too much paperwork required by FT and Board of Education;
- -FT lesson plans were too demanding;
- -FT curriculum guides should correlate better with the Board of Education curriculum;
- -action should be taken on teachers' suggestions;
- -too much emphasis on isolated skills occurred;
- -the Slosson Language Test was too time-consuming.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Follow Through classroom observations were conducted during the fall and spring of fiscal 1980. The observations centered on the interaction between the teachers, teacher aides, and pupils.

Cultural Linguistic Approach

During the observations some teachers discussed the philosophy of the program, which was centered on racial pride and self-awareness. The instructional displays in most Cultural Linguistic classrooms concentrated on materials related to black pride. Some displays emphasized color in the alphabet cards, famous black personages, black pride mottoes,and children's art work. Supplemental types of materials such as manipulatives, toys, books, instructional charts, pictures, children's work, ditto materials, and art supplies were in evidence in these rooms.

The atmosphere of the clasrooms varied. Some were neat and others were in disarray. One observer was quite enthusiastic in the description of a primary level teacher and the classroom:

> Terrific teacher, industrious aide, super room environment and climate. This room is dynamite, visually and educationally. The teacher and teacher aide provided alphabet and color charts for each desk. Sounds, blends, colors, months, vowels, charts were all over the room, on the windows, chalkboard, bulletin boards, above the boards, and on the walls. The pupils were industrious, the noise level was low, there was little movement. Unbelievable sight to see. Five different activities were in operation simultaneously and the pupils were on task.

Although other descriptions were not quite as graphic, they reported good teacher planning and classroom management.

Several other observations at the kindergarten level were in complete contrast. These reported screaming teachers, disorganization, noisy children, and general chaos.

Several teachers discussed their problems with the observers. The complaints included the shortage of supplies, poor lighting, and the high rate of teacher aide absenteeism. One teacher told of being "bumped" from an Augmented Staffing classroom and re-assigned to replace an FT teacher on maternity leave. This teacher and teacher aide had considerable difficulty in the management of the class.

The teachers were engaged in a variety of instructional activities. Some teachers instructed the entire class and others worked with partial class or small groups of children. Most aides were observed supervising children working independently and occasionally tutoring a pupil. The pupils were involved in reading for a purpose, developmental reading, math projects, language arts lessons, and instructional games. Overall approximately 80 percent of the teachers' time was spent in direct interaction with the pupls. On the whole the instruction content was organized, clear, adapted to the level of the pupils, and offered a reasonable challenge. The demeanor of most teachers was firm, fair, and friendly. A few teachers were disorganized, autocratic, and unable to control their classes.

Cognitively Oriented Approach

Each morning the teachers and pupils held planning sessions to determine the tasks of the day. There was an average of six learning stations in each classroom. The pupils had the option of selecting a learning center in one of the instructional areas. The choices included language arts, reading, art, mathematics, or writing. The observed pupils worked on a variety of activities. The majority of the pupils was engaged in independent developmental reading. A small number of pupils were reading with the teacher in a small group setting. Several pupils were working independently or in small groups on developmental and computation mathematics tasks.

There was an adequate supply of materials and equipment available in each classroom. In keeping with the Cognitive Approach guidelines, individual pupils worked on selected projects. Among these projects were language arts, art, social studies, writing compositions, and working in the "bank" (a math interest center) handling money. The teachers and teacher aides moved among the pupils the supervising independent activities.

The well-managed classrooms, good teacher planning, clearly defined learning center activities, and interesting lessons contributed to the positive learning environment of most observed classrooms. On the whole, the instruction content was adapted to the level of the pupils and offered the pupils a reasonable challenge. However, some classrooms were not well organized and the pupils appeared unable to work independently or in small groups. The interest centers in these rooms were poorly set-up and managed. The general appearance of these classrooms was cluttered and unkempt.

There was an aide in each classroom. A few teachers complained to the observers about the frequency with which aides were assigned to duties outside of the classroom.

Parent Involvement

The foundation of the parent program was the School-Community Representatives (SCR). The SCR's role as liaison between the school, home, and local service agencies provided an awareness of the needs of the parents and children. The parents recognized the SCRs as a service and information source and readily sought their assistance.

Parents also participated in special interest groups, instructional model workshops, inservice demonstrations, and training seminars planned and executed by local steering committees and Policy Advisory Committees. Some parents on the local committees also served as paraprofessionals. Parents from each of the six FT schools participated on the Follow Through Advisory Committee.

An analysis of parents' responses to a questionnaire indicated that there was communication between the parents and teachers. Only 79 percent of the parents were aware FT was a Title I funded activity. Ninety percent of the parents had visited their children's classroom during the year. A sizeable group said that they had assisted their children daily with homework assignments. Approximately 88 percent believed that they had guided their children to use their leisure time productively. Most parents felt that participation in FT was instrumental in the improved achievement levels of their children and 98 percent wanted to see the program continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Volume 2 presents the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) achievement results for FT participants in age cycles seven and above. Pretest scores reveal that these pupils began the year with mean standard scores equal to the average for all Chicago pupils of the same age. This confirmed that the previous achievement levels of these pupils were well above the average for Title I. Most Title I pupils in other activities were not average achievers on the pretest; however, FT was designed primarily for Head Start graduates to provide them with a four year background of experience to prevent low achievement levels such as those required for Title I participation generally.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=273)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	47%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	42%	No
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	5 mos.	No
Mathematics Total:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52%	No
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No

As Table 1 shows, none of the evaluation objectives were met. Overall, primary level Title I participants attained greater mean grade-equivalent reading gains than did the FT participants. In fact, the proportion of FT participants achieving standard score gains in reading and mathematics was less than in any other Title I activity. Pupils in only one of the FT schools met the reading objectives. Pupils in two schools met the mathematics objectives.

Since most of the pupils tested on ITBS were of age cycle eight, which is the last year of involvement in FT, and since the average FT pupil of this age began the year at grade level, the lack of grade-equivalent and standard score gains suggests that the final year of FT was unsuccessful in meeting participant achievement needs. In fact, in terms of standard scores, the FT pupils lost ground on average. This loss was, however, very small. In terms of percentile ranks, the FT pupils stood between the 57th and 58th percentile of all Chicago pupils, on average, at the pretest and at the same position on the posttest.

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were administered to 244 kindergarten FT pupils. The objective stated that 45 percent of the kindergarten pupils would exceed the fiftieth percentile in reading for kindergarten pupils nationally. Forty-seven percent of the participants exceeded the fiftieth percentile in reading, thus meeting the objective. FT participants also made higher scores on the CTBS than was true for all five-year-old Title I participants. The scores of 58 percent of the age cycle five FT pupils were between stanine 5 and stanine 9.

The CTBS math subtest was administered to 226 FT kindergarten pupils. Sixty-four percent of these pupils attained scores above the fiftieth percentile nationally, thus surpassing the objective.

The CTBS was also administered to 223 six-year-old FT pupils. Sixty-three percent of the FT pupils had scores above the fiftieth percentile in reading and 64 percent in mathematics, exceeding the reading and the mathematics objective. The FT age cycle six pupils also made much better scores on the CTBS than did the average Title I six-year-old.

These CTBS results, while excellent, cannot confirm whether it was Ft which produced them, the prior Head Start experience, or some other source.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The FT program cost approximately $639,991 in Title I funds to serve 1,402 pupils. The cost per pupil was $456. Additional funds were provided by EOA and the Chicago Board of Education. These additional expenditures meant that the actual per pupil cost was considerably higher than indicated here.

Given the achievement results for the older pupils in FT, the activity's cost effectiveness is questionable.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

FT was implemented, without problems, by October 15, 1979. The self-contained classrooms provided some positive services to the children, such as a teacher aide. Head Start graduates were given enrollment preference, but the activity was available to some other pupils who were in need of the instruction. There were personnel changes and staffing problems. The parent component was conducted by the SCR. Parents served on local committees and also as paraprofessionals. Most parents indicated a degree of knowledge concerning their role in the guidance and education of their children. They expressed a desire to see the program continued next year.

The ITBS results indicated low reading gains for age cycles 8 and 9, although pretest scores were just above the citywide average. Younger pupils did well on the CTBS. However, the data were insufficient to confirm that FT instruction was responsible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Follow Through may be effectively meeting the needs of some pupils in kindergarten and one or two years beyond kindergarten. However, it does not provide a sufficiently sound basis of instruction to warrant inclusion pupils through age cycle eight.

R&E #59
Project #619
Program #7642
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

MATHEMATICS LABORATORY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL SKILLS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Mathematics Laboratory for the Development of Computational Skills (ML) activity has been a part of the Chicago Title I project for three years. Eighteen public schools selected ML in fiscal 1980 to serve 1,500 pupils. Half of those schools had used the activity in fiscal 1979. Approximately 20 percent of the schools had used ML for the preceding three years.

Six schools purchased the option providing a teacher assisted by a teacher aide to instruct 100 pupils, in the third to eighth years beyond kindergarten, in five classes of approximately 20 pupils each. Twelve schools chose to purchase the activity in units of 75 pupils without the assistance of a teacher aide. In this option, class size was approximately 15 pupils per class.

The major instructional equipment provided by ML was the skill-drill computer. The vendor for this activity was the Monroe Calculator Company. An additional amount of $4.50 per pupil was available for supplies.

The major facets of the program were: the assessment of deficiencies, assignment of appropriate lessons, drill activities using the skill-drill computer, testing for progress, and the provision of enrichment exercises derived from the computer programs.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Principals based their selection of ML primarily on the criterion that it best met the needs of their pupils. They also cited its record of effectiveness in their schools and in other schools. Consideration was given to space availability and the program structure in relation to the talents of the instructional staff.

Implementation

The ML activity was implemented by October of fiscal 1980; however, variation in length of staff participation in the ML activity was noted. Three teachers were assigned as early as 1978 (the first year in Title I for the ML activity), while two teachers were assigned in the last half of fiscal 1980 in March and April. There were six teacher aides in ML. The four aides who responded to a questionnaire were assigned to the activity in September 1979.

Most of the ML administrators were enthusiastic toward their activity teachers. They rated them as very effective. Only two principals felt that their teachers' performance was average.

When ML was observed, it was noted that four classes were conducted in rooms that were smaller than regular classrooms: a small office, a cloakroom, a room about one-half the size of a regular classroom, and a small basement room. However, adequate implementation was noted for 14 of the 15 classes observed.

Some implementation problems were related to instructional material delivery. The refusal by the company to replace stolen equipment and difficulty in obtaining the assignment of one of the teacher aides were cited by the administrators.

Pupil Selection

ML generally served intermediate and upper level pupils. A number of principals, however, felt that it was also appropriate for primary level children.

Pupils were selected for participation in ML by teacher recommendation. Usually, the classroom and the Title I teacher were involved in the selection process. The pupils' need for remedial mathematics instruction was the major consideration for selection. The structure of the program, as it related to pupil learning styles, was also a factor in some schools.

The teachers were positive toward the pupils in the ML activity stating that most of them (approximately 90 percent) were actively and cooperatively interested in their work.

Inservice

Most of the aides stated that the ML inservice program was very good; however, teachers' ratings varied from poor to very good with the majority stating that the inservice meetings were good or very good. The principals were evenly divided between very effective and average in their ratings of the inservice program.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Most of the principals stated that ML was very effective in meeting the objectives. Their comments indicated that they felt it provided a different instructional approach from that experienced by the pupils in their regular classes, was more efficient in relation to space, and offered intensive drill activities needed by the pupils. Four principals, however, viewed the activity as average. They cited lack of flexibility due to the program structure as a limitation of ML.

Materials and equipment were viewed as very effective by most of the administrators, but three thought the materials were average and one rated the equipment as average. The service of the vendor was considered very effective by most of the principals, but five gave it only an average rating.

All of the teachers stated that they received adequate quantities of the instructional materials; however, they varied in their assessment of their quality. The majority felt that the materials were excellent, some stated that it was good, and one felt the quality was just adequate.

Most of the teachers were involved in the selection of the materials and were able to individualize instruction as much as they felt necessary using the materials. The majority of the teachers also found it moderately easy to correlate the ML materials with the CP/ML levels though some found it moderately difficult.

The operation of the ML activity was generally effective but certain problems did exist. The major problem was class cancellations. Classes were cancelled approximately 100 days in eleven schools reporting this information. One teacher recorded the cancellations by class period noting 101 individual class period cancellations (equivalent to one month of classes). The median for classes cancelled per school was 10 days for the eleven schools.

There was also an indication of problems in the attitude of the teachers toward participation in ML for the next school year. Though ten of the responding teachers stated that they would like to teach in ML the following year, three were undecided and one was certain that continued participation was undesirable. In turn, the same number of teachers who wanted to continue participation felt that ML was very effective, while the number that was indifferent or negative toward participation felt that the activity was only moderately effective.

Two-thirds of the aides responded to questionnaires. All were positive in their opinions of the teacher with whom they worked. They felt that the teachers' directions were clear, that the teachers had confidence in the aides' skills, that they felt comfortable with their teachers, and they discussed activity problems and/or new ideas with them.

The aides stated that they spent 50 percent or more of their time working directly with the pupils. The aides and the teachers were in general agreement as to the amount of time spent in the performance of various duties.

Sixty percent of the regular classroom teachers who sent pupils to ML noted that class instruction was missed by those pupils. A variety of subjects were listed in which instruction was missed. Language arts was most frequently reported. Missed work was made up in a variety of ways, usually by way of homework, special periods of instruction, and regular class assignments.

Most of the regular classroom teachers felt that they understood the methods and objectives of the ML activity. They stated that the activity correlated well with the school's curriculum.

Most of the regular teachers believed that the children benefited from the ML program. They also stated that the children increased in personal responsibility for themselves and their school work and in the amount of effort they expended in completing their assigned school work.

Staff Communication

As noted previously, communication between the teachers and teacher aides was very positive. The classroom teachers also indicated that this was the case in communication between themselves and the ML teachers. Some of the teachers stated that they did not communicate with the Title I teachers. The mode of communication for the majority of the teachers was by informal meeting. Most of the teachers also stated that the Title I teachers made special presentations for them in relation to the ML activity.

Classroom Observations

ML classes were observed in the fall and spring. The fall observation indicated that the activity services were provided largely for intermediate pupils. All teacher aides were assigned and most of them were on duty at the time of the observation. The classes were usually conducted in regular-size classrooms, although some were conducted in smaller rooms.

The ML pupils were observed working at the calculators or doing other seat work activities. The teacher usually supervised them, assisting individual pupils when needed. Group instruction was also noted. The aides assisted the teacher in supervising the pupils and also provided tutorial assistance to some pupils. Teachers' comments were usually neither positive nor negative. Often there were no remarks or comments made as would be expected when pupils are working independently on machine activities.

Spring observations indicated much the same pattern in pupil and staff activity. The instruction content was noted as being organized, clear, and relevant to the activity. The lessons were adapted to the level, capacity, and readiness of the pupils and was challenging. The assignments, directions, and/or questions were given by the teacher in a clear, definite, intelligible manner. The appearance of the classrooms varied but in most the student work was displayed, the rooms were neat, and instructional or motivational bulletin boards were present. The teachers were firm, fair, friendly, alert, and responsible. There was an established class routine and the students were self-controlled, starting their lessons promptly with a minimum of lost time or disturbance. Pupil comments and opinions were not a major part of the class sessions. The subject matter rather than the pupil appeared to be of paramount importance; however, individualization of instruction was very apparent. The teacher, through the results obtained from the tests and assignments completed by the students, determined the areas in which the pupils needed drill.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Twenty-eight parents of pupils in ML responded to a questionnaire. The parents appeared to be involved in the activity, for most of them had visited their children's regular classes and their Title I special classes. In fiscal 1980 they worked with the children on school related tasks more than in previous years. Their assistance with the childrens' homework was usually provided on a daily or weekly basis.

The parents were positive toward the ML activity and felt that their children benefited from the program and that it should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The ITBS was used to assess pupils' gains in mathematics. Overall, this activity had a mean grade-equivalent gain of nine months and 58 percent of the pupils had standard score gains. All age cycles except age cycle 14 met the eight month grade-equivalent gain objective, but only age cycles 11 and 13 met the standard score gain objective.

Individual school's average gains varied from five months to 1.1 years, with only 4 of the 18 schools failing to meet the eight months objective; however, only seven schools met the standard score objective. Although most pupils made progress, the gains were insufficient to close the gap between themselves and their non-Title I peers.

More detailed achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated total cost of the ML activity was $686,026. The cost per pupil was $457 and the cost per pupil contact hour was $3.92. These costs were average for pull-out and laboratory mathematics activities. Given its average achievement results, it is probable that ML was average in cost-effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ML pupils did exhibit academic achievement but less than should have occurred. The activity is best used with upper level pupils who need large amounts of drill in the basic mathematics computational skills.

It is recommended that the specific needs of each pupil be assessed before assignment to the ML activity. If most pupils need help in areas other than the basic mathematics concepts, other mathematics activities which include more advanced material or have an instructional approach that facilitates the development of problem-solving skills should be considered as alternatives.

Class cancellations should be avoided if optimal program operation is to be obtained and maximum pupil achievement is to be fostered.

ML has been assessed to be capable of meeting Title I pupils' needs and is recommended for continuation at schools where it is producing the desired results.

R&E #63
Project #234
Program #7661
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

ALTERNATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MATHEMATICS SYSTEM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Alternative Instructional Mathematics Systems (AIMS) activity from the Educational Development Laboratories, a division of McGraw-Hill Book Company was new in the fiscal 1980 Chicago Title I project. AIMS operated in six schools and served 500 intermediate and upper level pupils. Five schools served both groups and one served upper level pupils only.

A teacher with the assistance of an aide would provide 30-40 minutes of instruction daily to 100 pupils in groups of 16 to 24. An option for 50 pupils in groups of 8 to 12 was available for pupils in kindergarten through the third year but was not selected.

The instructional materials, equipment, and maintenance of equipment were to be provided by the program vendor as well as manipulative activities, games, sound-filmstrips, and listening activities. Self-correcting materials were designed to provide pupils with immediate reinforcement. An additional amount of two dollars per pupil was provided for supplies.

The major thrust of the program was to provide supplementary, developmental, and remedial mathematics instruction using multimedia materials.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

According to the principals, AIMS was selected primarily because it best fit the needs of the pupils and effectively used the talents of the instructional staff. Effectiveness elsewhere as a pilot program, cost effectiveness, and the provision of supplies and staff to the school were also reasons given for selecting AIMS. Consideration of the particular needs of intermediate pupils was also a major factor in its selection.

Implementation

Instruction began by October 15 in all AIMS classes as reported by principals and teachers. Full implementation, however, was delayed at in one school due to defective equipment. Classes began in September in two schools.

Pupil Selection

A range of from one and one-half to three years below the achievement of their peers was the chief pupil selection criteria used by the AIMS schools. Teacher recommendation was the major method by which eligible pupils were obtained. One principal specified the classroom teacher as the person who made the final selection of participants.

Staffing

The four AIMS principals who responded to an evaluation form were very pleased with the AIMS teachers. Staffing was evidently not a problem in AIMS in that the administrators did not report any difficulty in obtaining appropriate staff. The four teachers who responded to a questionnaire stated that the services of their aides were available to them throughout the year. The aides corroborated the statements of the teachers in that they reported their assignments as aides were made either in September or prior to the 1979-80 school year.

Inservice Program

The administrators rated the inservice program as average. Only one felt that the program was very effective. The four teacher respondents were evenly divided with reference to the quality of the inservice program, rating the program as good or very good. The aides generally rated the program as good.

During the first AIMS inservice meeting it was noted that management and equipment maintenance were problem areas which inhibited effective operation of the program. Topics of discussion at a subsequent meeting supported the original contention. There was a preponderance of problems involving exchange of materials and exchange of defective equipment. The headsets used in AIMS were of inferior quality and proved troublesome. Reasons of cost apparently led to the selection of this interior model.

Management was also a prime topic at the inservice meetings. It was felt by some that the grouping of pupils hindered individualization. Those with the unit of 50 pupils found it easier to individualize instruction than those teachers who had 100 pupils. It was noted that the closed campuses created a tighter schedule and also hindered individualization.

The vendor representative was concerned about the problems expressed by the teachers, but seemed limited in providing solutions.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The principals were divided in their ratings of the AIMS materials and equipment. Their ratings ranged from very effective to ineffective. Though only half of the teachers stated that they were involved in the selection of program materials, they were generally pleased with their quality. However, they stated that they received inadequate quantities of materials and supplies. They also stated that it was necessary to supplement the activity procedures and materials by providing worksheets and additional formal lessons in mathematics concepts.

Despite the aforementioned problems the teachers were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary. Most of them could easily correlate the activity materials with Chicago CP/ML levels. Only one teacher felt that such correlation was very difficult.

The movement of the pupils by groups, though a problem to the teachers, created a positive impression when AIMS was observed. The pupils worked independently or in partial class groups. They were attentive to their tasks, using the activity materials and hardware to complete their assignments. The teachers had optimally implemented the program. They provided group and individual instruction and supervised the pupils. Their comments to the pupils were frequently neutral but positive comments were also noted.

Teachers' instructions to the pupils were organized, clear, and relevant to the activity. The lessons were adapted to the level, capacity and readiness of the pupils, and were challenging. Assignments and directions were given in a clear, definite, and intelligible manner. Their attitude toward their pupils could be described as firm, fair, friendly, alert, and responsible. The learning environment evidenced an established classroom routine, self-controlled students, and a minimum amount of time loss or disturbance in beginning the lessons. Pupils' opinions were allowed and considered important. Individualization of instruction was evident.

In general, the teachers and aides were in agreement as to the aides' assigned duties. However, the aides stated that most of their duties were performed daily while the teachers stated that in several instances some of the aides prepared materials or supervised pupils outside the classroom less frequently. All of the aides and most of the teachers stated that throughout each day the aides assisted pupils individually with learning tasks, minor behavior problems, and personal needs.

Program Operation

The AIMS classes were generally held regularly throughout the school year; however, two of the teachers reported 10 class cancellations each. The teachers thought the activity was effective and they stated that they would like to teach it the coming year. The administrators felt that AIMS was very effective in meeting the objectives. The teacher and aide relationship facilitated the operation of the program in that the aides felt that they were given enough responsibilities to feel that they were doing a meaningful job, that the teachers had confidence in the aides' skills, and that their directions to the aide were very clear. The aides felt comfortable with the Title I teachers and were able to discuss activity problems and new ideas with them.

Two non-Title I teachers who responded to a questionnaire mentioned no problems related to the operation of AIMS. They stated that their pupils missed no regular work while attending AIMS because the teachers provided special periods of instruction to make up for any work missed or the teachers' instructional schedules were so structured that the AIMS pupils missed no important class work. The teachers felt that, compared to previous years, the pupils expended more effort and exhibited increased personal responsibility in performing their school teasks. The teachers felt that the pupils learned more as a result of participating in AIMS than they would have without the extra help.

Staff Communication

Title I teachers stated that they communicated with the homeroom teachers of their pupils on a weekly basis, usually in an informal manner. One non-Title I teacher corroborated this, while the other stated that there was no communication with the AIMS teacher. Neither of the non-Title I teachers were involved in the selection of the AIMS participants from their rooms. Despite limited communication, both teachers stated that they felt they understood AIMS' methods and objectives.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Twenty-nine parents returned questionnaires. They were positive toward AIMS and actively interested in their children's progress. Eighty-five percent had visited their children's regular classes and 45 percent the AIMS class. Most of the parents helped their children with their homework, usually daily or weekly. They felt that their children achieved more than they would have without the AIMS program. Most of the parents rated the program as excellent or good. All of them thought that AIMS should be continued.

The teachers generally felt that the parents were interested in their children's progress, but not always actively so. Two teachers felt that a small percentage of the parents were not noticeably interested or were noticeably uncooperative. A total of 50 visits from parents were recorded by the teachers, the number of visits per teacher ranging from 5 to 25.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

More than 65 percent of the pupils in four of the six AIMS programs achieved standard score gains in mathematics achievement based on ITBS results. All but one school exhibited an average grade-equivalent gain of more than eight months. All age levels met the grade-equivalent objective of at least eight months of gain. More than 60 percent of the participants at the upper age level achieved standard score gains. AIMS pupils achieved 10 months of grade-equivalent gain on average 62 percent obtained standard score gains.

Complete tabulations of achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated total cost of the AIMS activity was $232,846. The cost per pupil was approximately $466. The estimated cost per pupil contact hour was approximately four dollars per hour. When the ITBS achievement of the pupils is considered, AIMS was cost effective. However, considering the implementation and class cancellation problems discussed previously, it is questionable whether it was as effective as it could be.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The AIMS activity was new to the Chicago Title I project in fiscal 1980. The status of being new almost inevitably brings with it numerous implementation problems. That the achievement results were largely positive is highly commendable. However, much needs to be done with reference to ironing out operational problems. Cancellation of classes, though not attributable to the activity's structure, should be avoided in order to obtain optimal achievement from the participants. A review of the instructional materials should be made to provide appropriate and adequate supplementary work for AIMS pupils.

Achievement results indicated that AIMS may been more appropriate for upper age level pupils than for intermediate pupils. The complex structure of the activity could be a contributing factor to this. This same structure might make the teacher aide a more important staff member than in activities more simply organized.

AIMS has been assessed to be capable of meeting the needs of Title I pupils and is recommended to be continued in schools where it is meeting mathematics needs.

270

R&E #55
Project #632
Program #7655
Evaluator: Muriel J. Clarkston

INDIVIDUALIZED MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION: AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO REMEDIAL MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Individualized Mathematics Instruction: Eclectic (IMI-E) activity has been a part of the Chicago ESEA Title I project for eight years. During the fiscal 1980 school year 18 public and three parochial schools purchased IMI-E to serve 835 elementary pupils. The activity has been in four schools for four or more years. Two of these schools had selected IMI-E throughout its eight years of operation.

Program guidelines stipulated IMI-E would supply a teacher and a teacher aide to instruct 50 pupils in at least five classes of approximately 10 pupils each. Nine schools chose this program option. It was also possible to purchase IMI-E for 35 pupils to be taught by a teacher without the help of a teacher aide. In this case, class size was reduced to about seven pupils. Nine schools chose this option.

Instructional materials were to be selected by the participating schools. Title I provided $600 per 50-pupil unit and $420 per 35-pupil unit for this purpose. In addition, $5 per pupil was provided for supplies in both options.

The major thrust of IMI-E was to provide intensive remedial instructional services to supplement the basic mathematics curriculum. Diagnostic and prescriptive procedures were to be used to provide instruction to meet the needs of individual pupils.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Principals based their selection of IMI-E primarily on the criteria that it best fitted the needs of their pupils, had been effective in previous years at their schools, and/or the activity could be housed in the available space.

Implementation

Instruction began by October 15 in all IMI classes. However, several problems, lack of aides and late delivery of instructional materials, prevented full implementation in eight schools. Two thirds of the 12 teachers responding to a teacher questionnaire reported their classes began in September.

Pupil Selection

The services of the IMI activity were provided primarily to intermediate age level pupils. Five schools served upper age level pupils and one served some pupils in the primary age groups. Principals stated that the academic needs of particular age groups were considered when selecting IMI participants.

According to the principals, teacher recommendations with some consideration of test results were the major methods of participant selection. Two-thirds of nine board-funded teachers who responded to the Non-Title I Teacher Questionnaire and who sent pupils to IMI-E stated that they participated in selecting pupils in their schools. Approximately 83 percent of the Title I teachers participated in pupils selection.

Activity Staffing

The IMI-E principals were enthusiastic with reference to their activity teachers. Most of the principals stated that the staff was "very effective." Only one administrator rated an IMI-E teacher as average.

In their comments concerning IMI-E the principals emphasized the importance of obtaining qualified staff with such statements as:

> "...teacher is the key to the activity"
>
> "...very effective because of experienced superior teachers"
>
> "...experienced teacher available"
>
> "...the parochial principal should have input in selection of staff"

The assignment of aides was delayed according to a few of the IMI-E principals. This was not a severe problem for the teachers responding to the evaluation. The five responding teachers who were assisted by aides stated that they had such assistance for the majority of the school year. (Eleven units of IMI-E included a teacher aide.) Two of the aides had more than five years experience in the IMI-E.

Inservice Program

The IMI-E inservice meetings were conducted by the Title I program coordinator assigned to coordinate the citywide inservice program for the activity. A consultant from one of the state universities served as a presentor at each meeting. The inservice meetings consisted primarily of presentations of ideas, activities, and materials that the activity teachers and aides could use in their instructional program. The inservice program activities included field trips to mathematics laboratories and hands-on experiences (working with mathematics materials) for the IMI-E instructional staff.

Both the teachers and the administrators rated the IMI-E inservices as very effective. The aides, while not as positive as the teachers, felt that the inservice program was good.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Staff, Facilities, Materials, and Equipment

Administrators were positive toward the IMI-E activity, commending its flexibility in relation to material selection. It was felt by the administrators that the eclectic nature of the activity facilitated the provision of materials which were diversified and different from those used in the regular mathematics program. The flexibility of the program structure also enabled classes to be held in converted areas when space was limited. Several admini-strators felt that this was a "plus" for the activity; however, overcrowding was observed in several schools.

Title I teachers' statements with reference to materials supported the enthusiasm of the IMI-E school administrators. All Title I teacher respondents felt that materials were provided in adequate quantity. Most felt that the quality of the materials was excellent or good. The majority of this group stated that the materials were excellent. This is understandable in that ten of the twelve teachers were involved in the selection of those materials. Those who were not involved had been assigned to their positions after the school year had begun and after materials had been selected. The teachers also felt that they were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary using these materials. None of the teachers found it extremely difficulty to correlate the activity materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels. Only one found the task even moderately difficult.

The principals' enthusiasm with reference to the quality of their teachers would indicate that the IMI-E project was conducted with a high degree of efficiency. The feelings of the nine activity aides who responded to a questionnaire would tend to corroborate the principals' opinions. Their responses indicate that the teachers' directions regarding the duties of the aides were clear. The aides felt that the teachers had confidence in their skills and they usually felt comfortable with the teachers and could discuss problems and/or new ideas with them. The aides also felt that they were given enough responsibilities. They confirmed that 50 percent or more of their time was devoted to working daily with the pupils by tutoring, conducting group practice or drill sessions, assisting pupils with behavioral or personal problems, and supervising the pupils outside of the classroom when necessary.

Program Operation

IMI-E classes were conducted regularly; however, 102 class cancellations were reported by ten of the twelve teachers responding to the evaluation. More than half (66) of the cancellations were due to the need to substitute in other classes due to a lack of substitute teachers.

Comments were obtained from the board-funded teachers whose children participated in the IMI-E activity. In most instances the pupils from a particular room attended the IMI-E class as a group. Regular lessons were sometimes missed. The missed lessons were made up, usually by homework assignments but also through regular class assignments and special periods of instruction.

Most of the board-funded teachers were positive toward the IMI-E program, stating that the children benefitted from the Title I activity and learned more with the program than they would have without it. The teachers noted that there was an increase on the part of the pupils in personal responsibility for their school work and in their effort to complete their school assignments.

Though the regular teachers felt that they understood the methods and objectives of IMI-E and that it correlated well with their school's curriculum, comments were made relevant to the need for even closer relationships with the Title I teachers to correlate the regular and Title I program. One teacher's expression of disapproval of the pull-out approach because it disturbed her regular class routine (in addition to many verbal comments to this effect by administrators and teachers alike) should be noted.

Staff Communication

Both Title I and board-funded teachers noted that communication existed relative to pupil progress. The fact that most of this communication was of an informal nature should be noted. Administrators also stated that the two staff groups were in communication with each other. Again, informal rather than formal meetings were the communication mode. Some comments relative to lack of time in school schedules for more formal communications were made by both teachers and administrators.

Classroom Observations

The fall classroom observations conducted in IMI-E indicated that the activity's services were provided largely for intermediate pupils. Aides were on duty in most of the classrooms to which they were assigned. The evaluators who observed the classrooms noted that in thirteen of seventeen observations, the activity appeared to be adequately implemented. The sharing of space in four instances was the primary reason for feeling that implementation was not adequate for these four classes.

The evaluators felt that most rooms were attractive and were supplied with a variety of mathematics materials. The majority of pupils were absorbed in their work and the teachers provided individual attention for their pupils.

The pupils worked independently on most group or individual tasks. They also received instruction in whole class groups. During most of the observations, the pupils used workbooks, worksheets, or paper to complete written assignments. Often there were assignments listed on the chalkboard. In only a few instances were learning kits, programmed texts, or manipulatives noted in use. The teachers provided instruction for partial class groups, tutorial assistance, and/or generally supervised the pupils' work activities. Instruction was also provided for the entire class as a group. The aides generally supervised the pupils and, in a number of instances, provided tutorial assistance.

The teacher's oral comments during the observed classes were predominantly neutral; however, there were many positive comments and often no comments were made. No negative remarks were noted.

The spring observations elicited somewhat different data than those of the fall. It was noted that IMI-E teachers were devoting more of their time to tutorial assistance for pupils and the teachers' activities were more diverse than in the fall. Supervision was still the most prevalent activity and whole-class instruction was the main activity of only two of the teachrs. The aides devoted more of their time to record keeping, marking work, or testing; however, as in the fall, a major part of their time was spent in providing tutorial assistance to the pupils.

As in the fall, it was felt that IMI-E was well implemented. In all instances the evaluators felt that the teachers expended effort to provide more than the minimum implementation.

It was also noted that instructional content was organized, clear, and relevant to the activity objectives; the lessons were adapted to the level, capacity, and readiness of the pupils and were challenging; the assignments, directions, and questions were given in a clear, definite, intelligible manner by the teacher; and the teachers were firm, fair, friendly, alert, and responsible.

The learning environment exhibited self-controlled students following established class routines, starting lessons promptly with minimum loss of time or disturbance. Student opinions were allowed and considered important, and the activities, to some degree, were student-directed. The teachers were strongly subject-oriented, but they were devoted to helping their students by individualizing instruction.

The majority of the pupils gave better than average attention to their lessons. They usually worked on group tasks. Some class groups evidenced more individualization in that they worked on individually prescribed lessons. Only two pupils were noted as receiving tutorial assistance; however, this information represented only a portion of the observation period. The more varied atmosphere evidenced in the spring included more movement of teacher and aide from group to group.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Overall, IMI-E pupils had a mean grade-equivalent gain of nine months, thereby meeting the evaluation objective. Sixty-three percent of the 636 IMI-E pupils with pre- and posttest scores on the Mathematics Total section of the ITBS showed positive standard scores, thus exceeding the objective. All age groups met the grade-equivalent gain objective, and only age cycles 11 and 12 failed to meet the standard score gain objective. Of the seventeen public schools with ITBS results, eight achieved the standard score gain objective and all but two met the grade-equivalent gain objective.

Additional achievement data appears in Volume 2 of this report.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parents of the IMI-E participants were positive toward the activity. Ninety percent of those responding to a questionnaire (20 parents with children in 13 schools) stated that they were aware of their children's participation in the IMI-E activity. Most parents (80 percent) had visited their child's regular classroom. However, only 50 percent of the parents stated that they visited the Title I classroom.

Most parents (65 percent) stated that they worked more with their children on school related activities in fiscal 1980 than they had in the previous year. Eighty percent of those responding helped their children with homework assignments, usually daily or weekly.

A rating of good was assigned to the IMI-E activity by 60 percent of the parents. Seventy percent of the parents felt that their children had achieved more during the 1979-1980 school year than in previous years. Eighty percent felt that the program should be continued.

Seventy-five percent of the Title I teachers indicated that most of the parents were either actively and cooperatively interested in their children's progress or were supportive of the Title I program, though not active in school matters.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

When cost, in terms of pupil achievement is considered, the IMI-E activity appeared cost-effective. Compared to the other mathematics activities, as well as the results from all Title I mathematics activities and components, a greater proportion of age levels of IMI-E pupils met the objectives related to grade-equivalent gains and standard score gains than any of the other mathematics activities or components.

The total cost, $636,051, and the per-pupil cost, $762, were average for mathematics pull-out activities.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The effectiveness of the IMI activity seemed to depend on the initiative, ingenuity, and expertise of the teacher. The data indicated that in a number of instances operational and management problems were resolved by the teacher with the result that pupil progress was above average.

Such problems as inadequate facilities, lack of staff, and class cancellations seemed to occur randomly among the activity schools. Although not necessarily indicators of success or failure, these problems occurred frequently enough to perhaps inhibit optimal results. For example, the four most successful IMI-E schools exhibited one or more of these problems and yet the pupil achievement was notably good. It is apparent that the IMI-E principals' faith in their IMI teachers was justified in that they could so successfully offset these operational problems.

For those schools which might consider purchasing IMI-E, the option that offers only a teacher without an aide could prove economical and effective. However, this option enrolls fewer pupils.

Teacher satisfaction was high in IMI-E. This was probably fostered by the degree of involvement of the teachers in organizing the activity, in selecting materials and participants, and in instructing the classes. Administrators should consider these factors to facilitate obtaining optimal results from the activity.

IMI-E has been assessed to be capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation at those schools where it is producing the desired results.

R&E #56
Project #632
Program #7655
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

INDIVIDUALIZED MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION: WYNROTH MATH PROGRAM

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Wynroth (IMI-W) option of the Individualized Mathematics Instruction activity had existed for two years in fiscal 1980. Four schools, two public and two nonpublic, selected IMI-W to serve 185 pupils. Two of these schools had used IMI-W the previous year.

Three schools chose the IMI-W option providing a teacher with a teacher aide to serve 50 pupils; one school chose the option which provided a teacher for 35 pupils. The IMI-W teaching load required five classes daily of 7 to 12 elementary pupils meeting in a classroom or space equipped for the IMI-W program.

Title I provided the IMI-W materials. An additional $2 per pupil was provided for supplies.

The major thrust of IMI-W was to enhance motivation and increase mastery of basic mathematics skills. Motivational games and materials, sequenced to facilitate proper development of the basic mathematical concepts and skills, were IMI-W's principal tools. The pupil was required to master each level before proceeding to the next higher level.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

IMI-W was a new activity for both public schools. One school served intermediate pupils while the other served primary pupils. Full implementation occurred in one school without problem. One school had selected the option of teacher and aide while the other had selected the teacher only option. The aide was not assigned until after October 15, the date full implementation was to be attained.

The principals were enthusiastic about their staffs, rating them as very effective. The principals also rated the inservice, activity materials, and vendor services as very effective.

Inservice

Several inservices were conducted. The teachers, like the administrators, rated them as very good. Observation of one of the inservices indicated interest and enthusiasm on the part of the teachers. The teachers received suggestions and clarification of the program concepts from its author, Dr. Wynroth.

Instructional Program

The teachers were enthusiastic with reference to the quality of the instructional materials and stated that they received adequate quantities of them. The teachers were involved in the selection of the materials. This may have contributed to their feeling that they were able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary using those materials. Also, the teachers stated that it was very easy to correlate the instructional materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels.

The IMI-W classes were conducted regularly. In one school, the classes were held in the corridor. That teacher stated that classes were cancelled on ten days while the other teacher recorded only two days of class cancellation.

The teachers stated that most of the pupils were interested in the activity program, with one of them stating that all of the pupils were actively and cooperatively interested in IMI-W. Though the teachers noted that it was necessary to supplement the Wynroth materials, they stated that the program was very effective and they would like to teach in the activity in the following year.

Classroom Observation

Spring and fall observations of the IMI-W classes indicated varied degrees of pupil interest. The spring observations of both classes were made toward the end of the school year. This may have accounted for the lack of interest exhibited by a few of the pupils. However, the observation of the IMI-W pupils in the fall indicated that the children enjoyed the games and were working on their assigned tasks.

The instructional content was organized, clear, and relevant to the activity. The lessons were adapted to the level, capacity, and readiness of the pupils, and were challenging. The assignments, directions, and questions by the teachers were given in a clear, definite, and intelligible manner. The teachers were viewed as being firm, fair, friendly, alert, and responsible.

Though varied to some degree, the classes exhibited an established routine, self-controlled students, and lessons that started promptly with a minimum loss of time or disturbance. The teachers appeared to be concerned more with the pupils as individuals than with excessive emphasis on the subject matter.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

With the exception of two parents, the sample of parents responding to a questionnaire rated the activity as good. However, even the two parents who expressed dissatisfaction with the program felt that the extra help enabled their children to make more progress in their school work than they would have without it. Only one of the two dissatisfied parents had visited the program. That parent termed the program as "fair." The parent who had not visited it thought it was poor. All of the parents felt that the IMI-W activity should be continued.

The IMI-W parents' interest in their children's progress was evidenced by their statements that they worked more with their children in fiscal 1980 than previously and that they assisted their children with their homework on a daily or weekly basis. Though the number of parents who showed interest in their children's school work varied, the teachers stated that the majority of the parents were interested in their children's progress.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The pupils in both public schools achieved the objective of at least 8 months of grade-equivalent gains in Mathematics Total on the ITBS. More than 70 percent of the participants in both schools had positive standard score gains, thus meeting the objective requiring at least 60 percent of the participants to achieve such gains.

Pre-test standard scores indicated that pupils in IMI-W began the year further behind in mathematics skills than those in any other mathematics activity. Matched results for 40 intermediate level pupils in the public school serving this age level showed that almost all of these pupils made significant achievement gains.

Additional achievement data appear in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of the Wynroth activity was estimated at $143,928. The cost per pupil was $778 and the cost per pupil contact hour was $7.55. When cost is compared to pupil achievement, the IMI-W activity appeared to be cost effective.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the public schools using the IMI-W activity, it was very successful, meeting the objectives. The results for this activity exceeded that of its partner which used an eclectic approach. The structure of IMI-W was undoubtedly a contributing factor in that children like games and would be motivated and challenged by them. The game approach was also an important factor in overcoming the less than desirable location of the classes in one school. It is notable that 85 percent of the pupils in those classes met the standard score objective.

Few schools selected this component. Combining IMI-W with the IMI-E option might prove to be a worthwhile modification of the IMI activity; however, this should not be attempted until a thorough examination of the IMI-W structure has been made and the author of the program is consulted so that maximum effectiveness can be obtained from the combined activity.

The IMI-W activity should be considered by Title I schools seeking to replace a mathematics activity not producing the desired results. The evidence suggests that it is especially effective in meeting the mathematics needs of the lowest-achieving intermediate level pupils.

R&E #66
Project #237
Program #7704
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

PRE-ALGEBRA DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Pre-Algebra Development Centers activity (ALG) was a new activity in the Chicago ESEA Title I project in fiscal 1980. ALG was in three schools serving 225 upper level pupils in the seventh and eighth of years of school beyond kindergarten.

The program guidelines of the Chicago ESEA Title I project stipulated that a teacher with the assistance of an aide would provide instruction for 75 upper level pupils. Classes of 15 pupils each were to be scheduled to receive 40 minutes of instruction each day in a classroom equipped for the ALG program.

The instructional materials, equipment, diagnostics and remedial materials, and supplies were provided as part of the instructional unit. The publisher of the major instructional materials was the Inner City Press.

An extensive inservice was to be conducted to familiarize teachers and aides with ALG and its management system called the LCD technique.

The major thrust of the program was to include concentration on concepts, diagnosis and remediation, the building and maintenance of computational skills, and reading in mathematics designed to facilitate problem solving. The proposal stated that the program was correlated with the Chicago public schools' Continuous Progress levels. ALG had originally been a Title IV-C national diffusion project.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The Pre-Algebra Development Center activity was selected because of its reputation for providing upper age cycle pupils with the skills necessary to facilitate their success with high school mathematics, especially algebra.

Its multi-phased approach seemed appropriate for obtaining optimal achievement from the pupils receiving these services.

Implementation

Two Pre-Algebra Development Centers were implemented before October 15. One school administrator stated that there were no implementation problems; however, subsequent statements from the ALG teacher and the principal's evaluation of the vendors' services indicated that problems did exist though they were not originally perceived as such due to promises made by the vendor to take corrective action as necessary. The third center was implemented after October 15 and was not fully implemented until the second half of the year, when the required teacher aide was finally assigned. Lack of the basic program materials was a problem throughout the year in all three schools. As a result of this deficiency, the administrators stated that the vendor service to the ALG activity was ineffective.

Pupil Selection

Teacher recommendation was the method by which pupils were selected and the classroom teacher usually made the recommendations related to final selection. Two principals indicated that both the classroom and Title I teacher conferred with reference to pupil selection.

Staffing

The principals were generally pleased with their ALG activity staff. Two felt that their teachers were very effective. One stated that the teacher was average.

Inservice

Teachers and administrators were divided in their opinions of the quality of the ALG inservice program. The administrators rated inservice as average while the teachers gave all possible ratings except poor.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The attitudes of the principals and teachers toward the ALG activity was ambivalent. Two administrators thought the activity was very effective in meeting the objectives and gave the materials the same rating. However, one administrator rated the activity average in both areas and one teacher felt that the activity was only moderately effective and could not decide whether teaching in the activity the following year would be desirable. (The teacher and administrator were not from the same school.)

The teachers were completely divided in their opinions of the quality of the materials. Though none felt that the materials were poor, their ratings included adequate, good, and excellent, each teacher selecting a different rating. All of the teachers stated that materials and consumable supplies were not received in adequate quantities. They also stated that it was necessary to supplement the materials they did receive. It is possible that the failure of the major supplier of the materials to provide all the basic items may have contributed to the uncertainty and dissatisfaction expressed by the administrators and teachers.

The teachers indicated that it was possible to individualize instruction though they varied in the degree of individualization of instruction that was possible. They were generally not involved in selecting the materials, but they found them easy to correlate with the Chicago CP/ML levels. They stated that more than 90 percent of the pupils were interested in the activity tasks.

The aides were generally positive with reference to the ALG activity but expressed some uncertainty concerning their relationship with the teachers. Only one aide was completely satisfied with that relationship. The uncertainties expressed by the aides were in the following areas:

- -having enough responsibilities so that helping individual pupils was facilitated;
- -degree of teacher's confidence in the aides' skills;
- -a relationship with the teacher that facilitated the discussion of problems and new ideas related to the activity

The teachers and aides generally agreed about the duties performed by the aides but differed on the frequency with which the tasks were performed.

Direct observation of ALG classes indicated varied reactions to the activity; however, most were positive. The instructional content was organized, clear, and relevant to the activity objectives. The lessons were adapted to the level, capacity, and readiness of the pupils and were challenging. The assignments, directions, and questions were given in a clear, definite, and intelligible manner. The teachers were firm, fair, friendly, alert, and responsible. The classroom routine was clearly established and the students were self-controlled. Lessons started promptly with a minimum loss of time or disturbance. Student input was usually allowed and considered important. There was evidence of student direction in the activities being performed. However, it was not very clear whether the teachers' primary concern was the subject or the pupil. Nor was the degree to which individualization occurred clear.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The eleven parents responding to a questionnaire were positive toward the ALG activity. Most of the parents had visited their children's regular classes but few had visited the Title I class. Most of the parents worked more with their children than in previous years, felt that their children used their free time more profitably than previously, and felt they learned more as a result of participating in the ALG activity than they would have without the program. The program was rated good or excellent by the parents and all of the parents stated that it should be continued the following year.

The teachers indicated that approximately one-third of the ALG parents visited the school at their request or voluntarily. They rated parental interest in the ALG participants' progress as often active and usually interested.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupil achievement was as varied as were other aspects of the ALG activity. For all ALG pupils with matched ITBS pre- and posttest scores for Mathematics Total, the mean grade-equivalent gain was nine months, which met the Title I objective of eight months grade-equivalent gain. Only age cycle 12 failed to meet the objective, but even these participants met it in mathematical problem solving although not in mathematics concepts.

Overall, 54 percent of the participants had standard score gains, thus failing to meet the objective of 60 percent having gains. Only age cycle 14, 71 percent of whom had gains, met the standard score objective. Only one school met both achievement objectives. The average grade-equivalent gain in that school was 13 months and 66 percent of the participants achieved standard score gains.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The estimated total cost of the Pre-Algebra Development Centers was $111,561. The cost per pupil was $496 and the cost per pupil contact hour was $4.25. Given the average academic performance of the pupils enrolled and the below average per pupil costs, it would appear that ALG was a somewhat cost-effective activity.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

It is unfortunate that an activity that has proven itself successful elsewhere should enjoy only limited success in Chicago's Title I project. The failure to receive an adequate supply of activity materials may have helped limit pupils growth. Class cancellations, although not as prevalent as in some other activities, may also have contributed.

The aura of ambivalence which permeated the entire activity was reflected in the achievement of the young people for whom the services were provided. The program structure may have been adequate, the staff qualified, the pupils interested, the parents cooperative; nevertheless, the results did not live up to expectations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A change, if possible, in the distributor of the program materials should be effected immediately. All aspects of the staff development component should be rigorously implemented to insure that a cohesive effort is expended to help the pupils achieve the activity goals.

As currently implemented, ALG has been assessed as only occasionally capable of meeting Title I pupils' needs.

R&E #36
Project #603
Program #7635
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

AUDIO-TUTORIAL LABORATORY FOR INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS: MATHEMATICS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress (AT-M) activity has been a part of the Chicago ESEA Title I project for seven years. During the fiscal 1980 school year AT-M was in operation in one school and served 75 pupils in the fourth to sixth years beyond kindergarten. The activity was in its fifth year of operation in the school.

Program guidelines for Title I stipulated that one teacher, with the help of an aide, would provide instruction to at least five classes daily with approximately 15 pupils per class. Each class was to last forty minutes and to meet in a classroom especially equipped for AT-M.

Educational Development Corporation provided and maintained a laboratory containing cassette players, head-sets, sound filmstrip projectors, and audio flashcard readers. Consultant services and inservice training were also provided by the vendor. Three dollars per child was available for the purchase of incidental supplies.

The major thrust of the instructional program was to diagnose and to develop a prescription for the learning needs of each child. A classroom management system to facilitate individualization and a support system to indicate appropriate supplementary activities for each prescription were major components of AT-M.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

The Audio-Tutorial Mathematics project (AT-M) was selected because it was effective in the school in previous years. The program was implemented prior to October 15th according to the principal.

Staff consisted of a teacher and teacher aide. The teacher had been with the program since its inception and the aide had been with it for three years.

Both the teacher and the aide were positive with reference to AT-M. The teacher expressed no dissatisfaction with reference to the quantity or quality of materials. She was involved in the selection of those materials and found they facilitated individualization of instruction. She also found it very easy to correlate the AT-M materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels. The teacher stated that it was not necessary to supplement the activity materials, but she did so due to her "interest, expertise, and abundance of (personal) materials."

AT-M was implemented on September 13, 1979 according to the teacher. Her teacher aide was on hand at the beginning of the school year and her services were available to the teacher throughout the entire year.

The AT-M teacher stated that she communicated at least weekly, formally or informally, with the non-Title I teachers whose pupils she served. Although Individualized Learning plans (ILPs) were not required of mathematics projects, she developed such plans and provided the home-room teachers with them. The teacher felt that the AT-M project was very effective in comparison to other activities and she stated that she was sorry that it was to be discontinued due to lack of interest in it by other schools.

The responses of the aide indicated a positive attitude toward AT-M. Both the aide and the teacher tended to agree as to the aide's assigned duties during the year. Most duties were performed daily; however, duties like preparation of bulletin boards were performed much less frequently.

The aide estimated that she spent approximately 50 percent of the time working directly with the pupils. She assisted with learning tasks individually and in groups. She also generally supervised the pupils and assisted with minor behavior problems or personal needs.

The aide appeared generally satisfied with her role. She stated that the teacher's directions were very clear and that the teacher had confidence in the aide's skills. She usually felt comfortable with her Title I teacher and discussed activity related problems and/or new ideas with the teacher.

AT-M was observed in operation during the fall and spring. The pupils worked independently, receiving help from the teacher and aide individually. A variety of materials were used, i.e., learning kits, workbooks, work-sheets or writing paper and activity prescribed equipment. The teacher's remarks in the classroom were positive in tone.

The spring observation noted much the same type of activity. The aide, however, was not present. Most pupils were attentive, motivated, and responded well to their tasks. A few exhibited some restlessness and half-hearted efforts. It was noted by the evaluator that the weather might have been a contributing factor, as it was a very humid day.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parents of the AT-M pupils, according to the teacher, were interested in the activity. The teacher reported that 53 (approximately two-thirds) of the AT-M parents visited her to discuss their children's progress or problems.

Eight parents responded to a sample questionnaire concerning AT-M. They stated that they were aware of their children's participation in AT-M. Seven stated that they had visited their children's classroom teacher. Five parents reproted visiting the AT-M teacher.

Six of the eight parents stated that during the fiscal 1980 school year they worked more with their children than in the past and five parents said that they felt that the children used their time in a more useful manner than in previous years. Pupils were assisted with homework assignments daily by the majority of the responding parents.

All parents rated AT-M as excellent. The majority stated that they felt their children had learned more than they would have without the program. All of the parents thought the program should be continued.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

The average grade-equivalent gain in achievement of the pupils as measured on the ITBS was 1.0 years. Seventy-five percent of the participants achieved positive standard score gains. All age levels achieved the objective related to standard score gains and all except age cycle nine pupils met the grade-equivalent objective of at least eight months of grade-equivalent gains. These results placed AT-M among the most successful mathematics activities. Although the results for fiscal 1980 are from only one school, the activity throughout its seven year history in Title I has exhibited similar results.

A complete tabulation of the achievement data appears in Volume 2 of this report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of the AT-M activity was $50,737. The cost per pupil was $6[illegible]. The cost per pupil contact hour was $5.79. From the standpoint of pupil achievement, AT-M appears to have been cost effective.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress in Mathematics activity, for its entire period in the Chicago ESEA Title I project, has been one of the more effective mathematics projects, although very few schools used it.

This activity should be considered for re-instatement in the Title I project at some future date. It is recommended that, if AT-M is reinstated, it not be combined with its reading component as was true in the past. The reading component appears to have been less successful than the mathematics.

R&E #21
Project #588
Program #7624
Evaluator: Muriel Clarkston

CAREER GUIDANCE LABORATORY

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980 the Career Guidance Laboratory (CGL) activity was in its fifth year in Chicago's Title I project and was to serve 240 pupils at three public schools. The pupils were to receive guidance and instructional services four days per week in forty-minute periods in a classroom equipped as a CGL laboratory.

One teacher with the assistance of a teacher aide would provide career guidance and instructional services in the areas of reading and mathematics to 80 pupils in groups of 16.

Materials provided by Pacific Learning Services included objective-based units, management charts, activity workbooks, role-playing cards, task cards, manuals and criterion-referenced tests, and non-textual instructional supplies and materials. Equipment included role-playing centers, cassettes, automatic scoring devices, and audiovisual equipment.

The purpose of the program was to provide an individualized, objective-based, and criterion-referenced career guidance program with emphasis on the reinforcement of pupils' reading and mathematics skills.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MEASUREMENT

Program Selection

The Career Guidance Laboratory was in its fifth year at two schools. Their principals felt that it had proved its effectiveness and that its continued implementation was desirable. The third school implemented CGL for the first time. District-wide emphasis on career guidance and its "open-classroom" structure were the reasons given by the third principal.

Program Implementation

Initial implementation was easily accomplished; however, problems related to staff prevented optimal operation of the activity in two schools. The teacher in one of the continuing schools transferred to a high school. The activity was conducted by substitute teachers with the help of the aide until a new teacher was assigned in March 1980. In the new school, the teacher aide left the activity and did not return; however, the CGL teacher did not mention this as a problem.

Pupil Selection

The age levels of pupils selected for CGL varied among the schools. The principals stated that teacher recommendation was usually the selection method used. One principal stated that the classroom teachers were involved in making the selection.

Staffing

The principals of the schools felt that they had very effective staffs; however, one principal felt that optimal effectiveness of the teacher was somewhat inhibited because of late assignment to the CGL activity.

Inservice

The ratings of the inservice program by the principals and teachers and the aide who responded to questionnaires were positive. All administrators indicated that the service of the vendor was very effective.

Instructional Program

The principals were divided in their ratings of the CGL activity. Two principals felt that the activity was only average with reference to meeting the objectives; however, the third principal gave a rating of very effective in this area. The two teachers who responded were also divided in their rating between very effective and moderately effective concerning the activity's performance; however, both teachers stated that they would like to teach in the activity the following year.

FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT

The opinions of the principals concerning materials and equipment followed two directions: average or moderate ratings from the school having the activity for the first time and ratings of "very effective" from the schools in which CGL was a continuing activity. The teachers' opinions followed this trend. Insufficient quantities of materials were an additional problem noted by the teacher of the new CGL activity. However, the teachers agreed that it was possible to individualize instruction using the materials and that it was moderately easy to correlate the materials with the Chicago CP/ML levels.

Observations of the CGL classrooms showed adequate and well-organized space in which instruction could easily occur. The aides seemed enthusiastic and absorbed in their work. The one aide who responded to a questionnaire stated that she was comfortable with her teacher and could discuss problems and/or new ideas with her. She felt that the teacher's directions were very clear and that the teacher had confidence in her skills. The teacher and the aide agreed as to the aide's duties and the frequency with which each type of task was performed.

The CGL pupils, when observed in the fall, were involved in language arts lessons. Their learning tasks were varied. They worked as an entire class group or independently on individual tasks. The teacher instructed the entire group, provided tutorial service, or supervised the pupils as they worked independently on their assignments. The teachers' comments were positive or neutral.

One regular classroom teacher responded to the CGL questionnaire. This teacher stated that the regular work was sometimes missed by her pupils but was made up by homework assignments. The teacher was positive toward the CGL activity, stating that it correlated well with the school curriculum. The teacher felt that the pupils who attended the CGL classes learned more than if they had not had the activity. The teacher had been included in the CGL participant selection process and stated that there was an increase in the pupils' demonstration of personal responsibility toward school and increased effort in the performance of academic tasks. The teacher stated, "the Title I programs....have been most helpful in making the students aware of their reading deficiencies and introducing them to materials for remediation."

Staff Communication

All CGL staff were positive with reference to communication between regular and Title I staff, activity operation, and pupil progress. Informal, formal, and written reports and conferences were the means by which such communication occurred. Frequency of communication ranged from daily to monthly.

The CGL teachers commented on the program content and operation orally and by written statements. One school used peer tutoring to meet a problem related to the difficulty of the reading materials for the primary pupils. One teacher felt that some of the equipment "served no purpose" and that the "Role Play" center was useful only with younger pupils. The teacher of the upper age level pupils was enthusiastic with reference to the career aspect of the activity and especially the resource speaker component. This teacher had been particularly active in obtaining a variety of persons representing various careers to speak to the CGL pupils.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parents of pupils at two of the CGL schools responded to a questionnaire. The parents were very positive toward the activity. Most of the parents felt that their children had achieved more than they would have had they not participated in the CGL activity. All of the parents stated that they thought the program should be continued. The CGL teacher respondents were divided in their rating of the parents' interest in the activity. One teacher stated that most of the parents were interested, while the other teacher stated that most of the parents were not noticeably interested in CGL.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Although there were no achievement objectives specified, the CGL activity provided supplementary experiences in both reading and mathematics. Each of the three schools obtained at least an eight month grade-equivalent gain in reading comprehension. Two of the schools also obtained over a year of grade-equivalent gain in mathematics.

Viewing the results for all CGL pupils, the average grade-equivalent gain for both reading and mathematics for all age cycles was 10 months, while the percent of pupils achieving a standard sore gain was 62 percent for both reading and mathematics. However, when age cycles are considered separately, the upper level pupils exceeded the other age cycles in achievement in both grade-equivalent gains and standard score gains in reading comprehension. The primary pupils exceeded the other age cycles in mathematics achievement, in both grade-equivalent and standard score gains. The primary pupils also exceeded the other age cycles in vocabulary gains.

Further information on achievement can be found in Volume 2 of this report.

A contributing factor to the relatively poor results for the intermediate pupils could be that the school which served most of the intermediate pupils was new to CGL. The complexity of the activity's structure could be a factor in limited achievement during the first year of the activity.

Information pertaining to the completion of subject matter units (called modules) was obtained from the schools serving intermediate and upper pupils. The objective requiring completion of at least four modules by 60 percent of the pupils was not met. However, in view of the achievement results, module completion appears not to have been a significant factor in the pupil's academic achievement.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of the CGL activity was $158,500. The per pupil cost was $660 and the cost per pupil contact hour was $7.07. Given the pupils' achievement, the CGL activity may be considered moderately cost effective.

Conclusions

The Career Guidance Laboratory activity has been discontinued. It was an expensive activity and was never implemented in more than four schools. Its classification as a special needs activity which did not provide daily instruction in the basic subjects also limited its likelihood of being selected. In addition, the amount of equipment, particularly the role-playing center, made it necessary that adequate space, at least a full-size classroom, be available to adequately implement the activity. This also limited the number of schools that could select it.

There were several positive points about the activity. One of these was its strength in the area of mathematics. Pupils were more successful with this subject than with reading. A second positive point was the achievement of the upper age pupils. This group was successful in both subject areas and the CGL may have been a motivating factor. However, it is also the case that older pupils typically gained more in most Title I activities. Vocabulary development was also somewhat effectively treated, though its effectiveness was not as pronounced.

The reading comprehension area presented a problem for most of the younger pupils. The limited success of the younger pupils with the reading comprehension portion of the activity was due largely to the inappropriateness of the readability levels of the CGL booklets. In the first evaluation of the CGL activity in fiscal 1976, it was pointed out that the reading levels assigned by the vendor to the booklets did not coincide with the readability of the booklet narratives. This was corroborated by the teacher of the primary pupils. Throughout the existence of the CGL activity at that school, the teacher and the aide had to read aloud the material to the younger pupils.

During fiscal 1980 (and perhaps earlier), peer tutoring was used to offset the time needed to give the additional help in reading needed by the younger children. The pupils doing the tutoring achieved very small gains in reading comprehension. The tutoring duties may have contributed to this low achievement. Pupils' tutoring work was in areas they had already learned and perhaps it did not extend to all skills they had achieved. The tutors, while spending time teaching, could not receive as much time as needed to help them make optimal gains in reading. This is a danger inherent in peer tutoring by pupils who need instruction themselves.

It is recommended that positive aspects of this activity be incorporated, where possible, in the Title I project.

R&E #52, 53 and 54
Project #622
Program #7653
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORIES FOR THE TEACHING OF READING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading (IL) began in 1967 using mobile classrooms. Since 1978 the IL personnel have provided instruction, materials and equipment to correlate and supplement the regular classroom curriculum in the local school but without the mobile units.

These Laboratories provide three options for the teaching of reading. During the 1979-80 school year 43 public and 11 nonpublic schools selected the Art (IL-A) option serving 4,650 pupils in the first through eighth years of school after kindergarten; 50 public and 8 nonpublic schools selected the Science (IL-S) option serving 5,680 pupils in the first through eighth years; and 11 public and 4 nonpublic schools selected the Creative Arts (IL-CA) option serving 1,125 pupils in the first through eighth years of school.

Any pupil enrolled in a Title I school was eligible for the IL program if he/she met the reading level requirements. The instructional materials and equipment were prepared or furnished by the laboratory coordinator. However, Title I teachers could use the materials when the coordinator was not visiting the school.

In IL-A, a coordinator, assisted by a teacher, visited each school approximately twice a month and worked with five groups of 15-20 eligible Title I pupils for 45 minutes each. All the demonstrations were to correlate with the art materials and techniques suitable for the particular age and achievement levels of the pupils served.

In IL-S a coordinator visited each school approximately once a week and worked with four or five groups of 15-20 eligible Title I pupils for 35-45 minutes, depending on the number of groups served. The sophistication and difficulty of the instructional concepts were to increase with the pupil's achievement level, age and experience. An additional auxiliary coordinator was available to each participating school to provide inservice workshops to Title I teachers.

In IL-CA, a coordinator visited each school approximately once a week and worked with five groups of 15 eligible Title I pupils for 45 minutes each. Pupils created and performed their own work using multimedia materials and read various literary works which they could perform.

In each option of this activity, the coordinators were to provide local school inservice training to Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils at least once per month.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection and Implementation

In the fall of 1979, school administrators indicated the IL was selected primarily because its materials and program content met pupil needs and provided skills that reinforced the school's curriculum. Past performance and cost effectiveness were other reasons stated. Administrators also chose IL if, after selecting the reading and/or math activities which met daily, they had some additional funds, for IL was created to fill an instructional gap at an affordable price.

Individual comments from the fall Administrator Interview included a variety of specific reasons for IL selection. Whereas most ESEA programs focused on reading, IL offered skilled personnel to provide instruction in curriculum areas sometimes neglected. The content of IL reinforced the curriculum and provided personnel, materials and equipment to schools where needs existed, and space, materials, or funds were limited. IL staff helped to expand ESEA services to more pupils at all age levels with three different instructional dimensions.

Implementation of the IL program occurred by the middle of October, according to principals interviewed: IL-A 91 percent, IL-S 86 percent, IL-CA 91 percent. Pupil scheduling or school reorganization hampered the initiation of instruction in a few school. Pupils selected for participation represented all age levels; some were enrolled in another ESEA program. In addition, teacher recommendations, reading levels, and pupils in need of additional motivation were other reasons stated for pupil selection.

As already explained, staffing varied with the IL options. IL experienced some changes mid-year as a result of personnel transfers to effect staff desegregation. A few principals indicated that these staff changes "dulled" the effectiveness of the program, primarily in the art and science options. The new teachers, many of whom came from high school settings, had to teach elementary pupils without the benefit of adequate inservice training. Administrators rated IL-A and IL-S personnel as very effective, IL-CA as average.

Inservice

IL coordinators and teachers worked in the schools Monday through Thursday. Each Friday, IL coordinators and teachers scheduled their own inservices for planning, transfer of materials, changeover to new instructional units, problem-solving, and discussions of methods for relating IL activities to language arts.

However, the activity guidelines indicated the coordinators would provide at least one period per month in each school for inservice training to Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils. These inservice meetings were to familiarize teachers with instruction materials and equipment, help teachers understand the application of the spiral development concept in IL-S, and demonstrate language arts techniques and communication skills that might be used in the regular classroom with curriculum content.

The local school inservice provisions were not entirely clear to school administrators. On the spring Principal Evalu-ation Form, administrators rated the inservice provided by IL personnel. Twenty-six percent of those having IL-A, 33 percent of those having IL-S, and 18 percent of those having IL-A were unaware that inservices were available or had not received inservice from the IL coordinators. Art coordinators provided workshops for teachers and pupils to decorate schools and hold art fairs. Science coordinators provided teacher inservice sessions to demonstrate equipment and sample classroom lessons. However, not all schools purchasing these IL programs received the same amount of school inservice. This is reflected in Table 1, based on responses from teachers in the Classroom Teacher Questionnaire.

Classroom teachers who did participate in local school workshops commented that these sessions were helpful to them in stimulating their own classroom instruction. Some teachers commented that the workshops gave them new ideas to use in class. They indicated that curriculum skills were in fact being reinforced and made teachers aware of new techniques and instructional materials.

TABLE 1. FREQUENCY OF LOCAL INSERVICES

Number of inservices	IL-A	IL-S	IL-CA
More than three	15%	13%	5%
Three	6%	5%	9%
Two	8%	19%	9%
One	19%	24%	50%
None	47%	31%	27%
Number of responses	72	78	22

However, some teachers lacked real understanding of the content, skills, and activities of the IL classes. The IL teachers could provide classroom teachers, whose pupils attended their classes, with a clearer understanding of the IL activities through regular workshops. Also, if the homeroom teachers were aware of the content, they might be able to expand the instruction to their whole class. One teacher indicated that the inservice workshops presented in the morning before classes began were too short. These workshops could have been given (if only once) during a half day inservice where more information could be shared. The staff development potential of all the IL options was not sufficiently developed.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

From classroom observations conducted randomly in the fall and spring, it was evident that operated in regular classrooms, shared facilities, hallways, auditorium stages, libraries, basement facilities, or in centrally-located open spaces. Not all areas used to conduct the IL activities were appropriate. Space needed to store IL materials was not always available. Distractions from others sharing the space or from people passing by were observed. Suitable work space (particularly for IL-A) was not always available.

Principals rated the IL-A and IL-S materials as being very effective. IL-CA materials were rated as average. Two principals commented that the IL-CA materials were inappropriate for elementary school. Classroom teachers responding to the Non-Title I Teacher Questionnaire took the time to make several comments regarding the IL programs. The materials used in the IL classes were generally praised for their ability to create interest, to provide stimulation, and to evoke a better understanding of the subject matter. Teachers commented they were able, for the most part, to correlate the material presented in IL to regular class instruction. A greater proportion of teachers whose pupils received art and science instruction were able to build upon the skills and experiences of the laboratory program in their regular classroom instruction than those involved in the creative arts option.

For the most part, classroom teachers felt the activities performed in the laboratory settings were appropriate for the age levels participating. However, some teachers did not feel the materials used or the lessons presented were always appropriate for the pupil's age, challenging, or creative. The instructional projects in IL were generally designed to be completed in a few sessions. Because projects changed frequently, teacher comments varied according to projects.

On the basis of classroom observations, the appropriateness of the materials and activity was judged average to above average in adapting to pupils' levels and challenging them. Some IL-A projects appeared to use little imagination. Teachers also commented that some art projects were preassembled by the IL-A personnel; the pupils' participation was limited to coloring or glueing.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations of a random number of IL activities were conducted in the fall and spring. Each option will be discussed in turn, followed by a general discussion.

IL-A:

Teachers were observed presenting lessons to the whole group, demonstrating the materials and techniques to be used. When materials were distributed, pupils generally worked independently supervised by IL staff. Individual help was provided, including positive encouragement. A variety of art supplies and materials were used. Pupils worked enthusiastically on assigned projects, though sometimes the classroom was noisy. Occasionally, the art project was a group effort.

IL-S:

Using a variety of science materials and worksheets, the IL personnel demonstrated science concepts. Depending on the lesson content, lessons were outlined using group discussion and problem-solving techniques before "hands on" experiences by groups or individuals was initiated. As pupils worked independently or in groups, IL personnel supervised.

IL-CA:

Whole class instruction was the predominant pattern observed. Using textual materials and worksheets, pupils worked together reading plays and poetry or reviewing language arts content areas. Independent seatwork and watching or listening to the teacher or their classmates were also observed by the evaluators.

Pupils in all three components of IL were observed as being on task, generally enthusiastic and attentive.

Both administrators and teachers commented on the motivational aspect of IL. The creative aspect of a child's' life does not always get the emphasis it deserves at the school level. One principal commented that IL-A motivates the disadvantaged child to see positive aspects about himself which in turn has a positive effect toward reading. This is applicable to all three options of IL, even though instruction was not on a daily basis. By providing teachers skilled in content areas and in the use of materials frequently pushed into the background of Title I concerns, IL generated interests in pupils for art, science, and creative arts.

Building a pupil's self-image, motivating individual creativity, providing problem-solving situations and encouraging active participation were some of the many positive comments received from teachers. Most teacher responses about IL personnel were very favorable. Although some teachers were not as aware of how reading and language arts skills were incorporated into the IL-A classroom, they were still enthusiastic about the program. Another effect of the IL service that teachers cited, particularly of IL-A and IL-S, was improvement in listening skills and following directions. Pupil pride in seeing a finished product was also mentioned in relation to IL-A and IL-S.

Random classroom observations during the school year could not reveal the many side effects of IL. Curriculum correlation, continuity, and total pupil effect was not always evident. However, the overwhelming enthusiasm of most teachers responding to the Classroom Teacher Questionnaire pointed out the cumulative benefits.

Not all teachers were enthusiastic, however, citing lack of inservice, sporadic communication, infrequent class sessions, not enough pupils receiving services, mid-year staff changes, and materials that were at times inappropriate for the age level served. Class cancellations and make-up sessions caused scheduling difficulties and some teachers found little correlation of the IL activities to the language arts skill areas. More communication between IL personnel and school staff in the form of workshops might ameliorate this situation.

Administrators and teachers most commonly agreed that the three options of IL succeeded in arousing the consistent interest and enthusiasm of pupils.

Participant Achievement

Standardized test results for the three options of the IL programs in fiscal 1980 are contained in Table 2.

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this section and explanations of the statistical terms used may be found in Volume 2 of this report.

TABLE 2. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES

Objective	Criterion	Activity Results Option	Activity Results %	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:				
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	IL-A	54%	No
		IL-S	55%	No
		IL-C	51%	No
Reading Comprehension subtest:				
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	IL-A	60%	Yes
		IL-S	57%	No
		IL-C	57%	No
-Mean grade-equivalent gains	8 mos.	IL-A	8 mos.	Yes
		IL-S	7 mos.	No
		IL-CA	7 mos.	No

N: IL-A = 1254, IL-S = 2381, IL-CA = 430

The achievement results indicate that only two objectives were met, both by IL-A. Since these activity options met infrequently and many pupils participated in other Title I activities, IL's effectiveness in improving reading achievement is hard to assess.

The achievement results may be explained by the fact that IL personnel concentrated on the subject areas and motivational aspects of the program and to a lesser extent on reading skill areas.

Although no formal data were collected to measure the affective areas of the IL programs, the response of classroom teachers suggested that as a supportive and motivational ESEA program, as a curriculum supplement, and as a "potential" staff enrichment and development source, the program could be effective.

That upper level pupils showed the greatest achievement gains is consistent with overall Title I gains. The pressure to qualify for graduation might have more significance than the program's impact.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Approximately 4,650 pupils participated in the IL-A option at a total estimated cost of $470,304. Approximately 5,680 pupils participated in the IL-S option at a total estimated cost of $574,479. Approximately 1,125 pupils participated in the IL-CA option at a total estimated cost of $113,783.

Cost per pupil was approximately $101 for all the IL components. This low cost was related to the reduced amount of direct instructional contact time with pupils. This minimum contact time may have been a factor in the achievement results. Only Field Experiences and Health Services, neither providing direct instructional contact, had lower pupil costs.

Although program costs would increase somewhat but probably remain substantially lower than that of most Title I programs, more frequent school visits might provide the continuity of instruction classroom teachers requested.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The Instructional Laboratories activity, in its fourteenth year, provided supplementary instruction in art, science, and creative arts. Eligible Title I pupils selected to participate in IL represented primary, intermediate and upper levels.

Although activity selection was based on the supplementary services provided, past performance and lower costs were additional considerations. Full implementation by the majority of schools posed few problems. Pupil scheduling and school reorganization were mentioned as problems by a few administrators.

IL personnel provided the materials and equipment necessary to manage the program.

One IL-A coordinator and one teacher, one IL-S coordinator sometimes assisted by a second coordinator, and one IL-CA coordinator provided instruction weekly or bi-monthly. Personnel changes occurred mid-year, to enhance staff integration. Inexperience in the program and inadequate initial inservice training hampered the momentum and perceived effectiveness of the programs.

IL staff worked in the schools four days a week, using one day for their own preparation and inservice meetings. Monthly school inservice workshops were to be provided by IL staff, but the provisions in the guidelines were not clearly understood by school personnel nor effectively, consistently, or equally administered to all schools by IL staff.

Local school workshops were well-received where provided; however, teachers were not always aware of IL content and its correlation with the school curriculum.

IL activities operated in a variety of facilities (classrooms, shared space, hallways, auditoriums, libraries), sometimes with inadequate space to store materials and minimize distractions.

The program provided motivational aspects and curriculum complements in spite of the low pupil instructional contact time and achievement results.

The achievement data did not support the IL options as an effective instructional program, regardless of its lower cost. However, as a supplementary program in art, science, and creative arts, as well as for its motivational potential, IL did provide a service to schools.

Title I pupils, according to teachers, were eager to participate in IL and felt pride and a sense of accomplishment in their work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The IL options should be continued with more explicit guidelines as to the supportive, motivational, and supplemental curriculum aspects of the program.

Clarification is needed, at the school level, regarding the stated inservice provisions of the activity.

Instruction in the reading, communication, and language arts skills in the IL curriculum should be intensified, consistent with the subject matter presented.

Materials and techniques should be suitable for the different ages and achievement levels being served.

IL content should be communicated to the homeroom teacher more consistently.

The IL personnel should supply the type of content and skills needed for staff development purposes in Title I schools.

The instructional contact time with pupils should be increased with additional personnel providing bi-weekly sessions.

IL, as currently implemented, has been assessed as being capable of meeting some needs of the local school Title I participants.

R&E #64
Project #244
Program #7944
Evaluator: Marion Rice

BILINGUAL EDUCATION MULTIMEDIA INSTRUCTION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Bilingual Education Multimedia Instruction (BEMI) served a total of 160 pupils in two public and one nonpublic schools in its first year of operation in Chicago in fiscal 1980. Children in kindergarten through the fourth year of school were eligible to participate. Materials and equipment were furnished by Midwest Visual Equipment Company and included System 80 machines, the Bell & Howell Language Master, Gould machines, filmstrip projectors, headsets, and study carrels. All the instruction was designed to meet the needs of children of limited English proficiency. Emphasis was placed on developing language and communication skills and on basic mathematics concepts.

Pupils in groups of 15 received a minimum of 30 minutes of instruction per day. A teacher was to be assigned to the 40-pupil laboratory chosen by two schools, and a teacher and an aide for 80 pupils in the other. Two of the laboratories were located in full-sized rooms; the third shared space with two other classes.

Preservice training and continuing consultant services were to be provided by the Midwest Visual Equipment Company.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

The three main reasons for selecting the activity were: the instructional emphasis and methods best met the needs of the pupils in the school, BEMI promised to be very cost effective, and it best used the talents of the schools' staff.

Initiation of Instruction

Instruction was begun in all schools by October 15. Correlation of Title I materials with Chicago CP/ML Levels was moderately easy.

Staffing

Teachers were assigned at the beginning of the school year. One aide was assigned late and then replaced at mid-year. Staff was rated very effective by BEMI principals; this placed it higher than the average overall Title I rating for staffing.

Inservice

The vendor and the Board of Education coordinator provided a full-day workshop as required in the guidelines. The vendor who supplied the wireless broadcaster and its hardware did not provide the training component for the facility; thus, the principals rated the inservice component for BEMI lower than the average overall rating for Title I inservices.

One teacher returned a questionnaire and rated inservices as generally good, except for inservices provided by local school staff for which the rating was very good. The reverse was found for on-site consultations, i.e., all on-site consultations were rated good except for those provided by local school staff which were rated poor. Inservice was perceived as improving classroom instruction.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

In one school, because the space was shared with two other classes, the BEMI room was crowded with pupils and equipment. Two other laboratories met in full-sized classrooms.

The wireless broadcaster and its components were delivered after the implementation date. Other materials were delivered promptly; no problems were reported with respect to supplies.

BEMI principals gave the highest rating to the activity in terms of materials and equipment; however, vendor service received only an average rating, i.e., materials and equipment were rated higher than the average for Title I and vendor service was rated lower than the average.

Instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity and the quality of the instructional materials was excellent according to the one teacher questionnaire received. Title I consumable supplies were adequate in quantity and the teacher was able to individualize instruction to the extent necessary. This teacher was not involved in the selection of materials.

Efficiency of Operation

Classroom observations revealed that the average enrollment in BEMI was 11.5 and the average attendance was 10.5. All students were found to be on task. The percentage of direct instructional interaction time was somewhat less than for other activities, i.e., 63 percent versus 86 percent.

The teacher completing the questionnaire said that BEMI classes had been cancelled 18 days during the school year which was higher than the 10 days typically found in other similar activities. The teacher was familiar with other Title I activities and considered this activity to be comparatively very effective.

Pupil Response

Most students were actively and cooperatively interested in the activity.

Activity principals gave the activity the highest rating with respect to its effectiveness in meeting objectives.

Parent Involvement

Ninety-five percent of the 23 parents of children in BEMI who returned questionnaires were aware that their children participated in a Title I program; this percentage exceeded the 90 percent required by the objective.

Seventy-eight percent of the parents had visited their children's regular classrooms and 36 percent had visited their children's Title I classrooms. The parents' ratings of the activity, on the average, tended to be higher than the ratings of parents with children in other activities, even though there were proportionately fewer who gave BEMI the highest rating. BEMI also compared favorably with other activities in terms of the parents' perception of their children's achievement and their desire to have the program continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Table 1 shows that all the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) achievement objectives were met, except one. To require that pupils of limited English fluency achieve eight months of gain on a test of English reading comprehension may have been too difficult.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=22).

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	71%	Yes
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	64%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	7 mos.	No
Mathematics Total:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	71%	Yes
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	10 mos.	Yes

With respect to the standard score and grade-equivalent gain objectives in reading, BEMI was average for special needs laboratory activities. The activity exceeded the Title I average for the percent of pupils having standard score gains in reading, i.e., 64 percent versus 58 percent; however, it was lower than Title I overall in grade-equivalent gain (seven months versus eight months for Title I overall). Vocabulary grade-equivalent gains were excellent, i.e., nine months versus seven months for Title I overall.

The percent of pupils having standard score gains and grade-equivalent gains in mathematics surpassed the overall Title I average, i.e., 76 percent and 10 months versus 56 percent and eight months.

Seventeen six-year-old pupils took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Nine exceeded the national average.

Objectives were also specified to measure gains in English oral and reading fluency. Bilingual placement categories for both the beginning and the end of the fiscal year were available for only 25 of the 160 or so pupils enrolled in BEMI. Of these, 23 were reassigned to a higher category by the end of the year. This suggests a good transitioning rate and the meeting of the objective.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

BEMI's estimated total cost was $119,123 for 160 pupils. The cost per pupil was $745 and the cost per pupil hour of instruction was $8.50. The cost per pupil hour of instruction exceeded that of other special needs laboratory activities. It was also higher than the cost for the Language in Transition activity.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

Administrators selected the activity to best meet the needs of pupils with limited English proficiency.

No problems were cited with respect to implementation.

Vendor did not provide inservice training for the wireless broadcaster.

Materials were provided promptly, received in adequate quantity, used for individualizing instruction, and considered excellent.

Most students were observed to be on task and cooperatively interested; however, direct instructional interaction time was not as great as in some activities.

Parents were aware that their children were participating in a Title I activity; more than a third of the respondents had visited the Title I classroom and many considered the activity excellent.

The activity exceeded the Title I average for the percent of pupils having standard score gains in reading and vocabulary. The reading grade-equivalent gain was lower than the Title I average and the vocabulary grade-equivalent gain was greater than the Title I average.

Mathematics gains were well above the grade-equivalent and standard score gains for Title I overall.

Cost per pupil hour of instruction was more than for other special needs laboratory activities; it was also more than Language in Transition activity.

Recommendations

Require all vendors to participate in the inservices so that the use of materials can be demonstrated.

Try to reduce costs, if possible, without reducing effectiveness.

BEMI has been assessed as effective in meeting the needs of limited English speaking Title I pupils and is recommended for selection by local schools to replace activities not producing desired effects or meeting local school needs.

Summary

The activity met all the achievement objectives except one. Obtaining inservice on all equipment was a problem. For a new activity, BEMI seemed to be functioning very well.

R&E #16
Project #572
Program #7621
Evaluator: Joseph Schroeder

BASIC OCCUPATIONAL AND SKILL TRAINING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

During fiscal 1980, the Basic Occupational and Skill Training (BOAST) activity funded under Title I was conducted at seven Education and Vocational Guidance Centers. This was BOAST's 15th year in the Chicago Title I project.

Over 700 pupils were selected to participate. They were eligible Title I pupils identified by school staff as being serious underachievers in reading and other academic areas and potential school dropouts. The age of participants ranged from 13 to 16 years.

As a means of motivating pupils to remain in school the activity was to provide vocational experiences in a fully equipped shop setting for groups of 18 to 20 pupils. Shop offerings varied from center to center and included facilities for training in wood, plastic and metal projects, offset printing, silk screening, electricity and home skills.

Staff of the centers varied depending on selection by the principal and based on funds available. A special service coordinator was to be responsible for the guidance and general organization of the BOAST activity at the school. Shop teachers were to have vocational assistants and aides were supposed to tutor pupils to upgrade achievement in reading. Home visitors were to be responsible for developing close school-home relations and increasing parent involvement.

BOAST staff were to receive inservice from district coordinators and persons related to industry. They were also expected to articulate with the participants' regular classroom teachers in order to assist in the academic development of the child.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Initiation of Instruction

On-site visitation by field evaluators during the spring and fall of fiscal 1980 indicated that BOAST did have a variety of shops operating. It was noted, based on observations and interviews with staff, that the activity was not operating as it could because of limited funding. In some instances special service coordinator positions were not filled nor were home visitor and aide positions. Teachers and administrators indicated the need for funds in order to repair and purchase equipment. These short comings in the activity hindered completed implementation. One may assume that guidance service and parental involvement were decreased if there was no staff to provide the services.

Staffing

The majority of BOAST staff were experienced instructors, aides and vocational assistants who had been with the activity for an average of seven years. Though most of the 11 teachers had an aide during the year, two reported not having an aide and one teacher had an aide for less than half of the year.

Aides indicated that the teachers they assisted had confidence in their skills and that directions given them by teachers were clear.

Though staff at the centers were rated highly by principals, it was evident due to a cutback in funding, that the activity did not provide the full services as in past years.

Inservice

Inservice during the year was generally handled by school and district staff because of the inability to purchase equipment and materials from vendors who usually supply the inservices with purchases.

The number of inservices reported by BOAST teachers ranged from four at one center to 30 at others. All of the 11 BOAST teachers surveyed rated their inservice meetings as good or very good. Except for one teacher, all indicated that the inservice helped them to improve classroom instruction.

Participants

BOAST participants were boys and girls aged 13 through 16 years. Pupils selected for the activity were referred because of serious academic under-achievement and poor attendance in the regular school setting.

During classroom visitation by Title I evaluators, 42 participants were observed individually at the various

BOAST centers. Generally, observations showed that pupil tasks were of a group or independent nature. The majority of participants were noted to be on task under the instruction or supervision of a teacher and vocational assistant. Assigned work during observation included using workbooks, small tools, printing equipment, cooking equipment and other vocational equipment such as drill presses, lathes etc.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facility and Operation

Generally, BOAST facilities were observed to be adequate or better for vocational instruction. Shops appeared to be well equipped and adequate in relation to size, lighting, and safety. It was evident during observation that some equipment was in need of repair such as printing presses and engraving machines. It was also reported by shop teachers that there was a shortage of materials and money to spend for needed repairs. In spite of this, teachers did indicate that they were able to conduct the activity, and pupils were observed making a variety of items. BOAST projects included the production of various items made from wood or plastic and the printing of calendars, programs, and flyers. In addition, BOAST pupils made rubber stamps, business cards, desk name plates, and clothes. The teaching of vocational skills and work habits were evident during shop observations.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The majority of BOAST teachers reported that parents were generally interested but not too active in the BOAST activity. All of the sampled BOAST parents indicated that they favored the continuation of the activity. The majority of these parents also noted that they were more aware of the student's needs and assisted the student with homework due to the BOAST activity influence. Classroom visitation by parents was minimal.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The BOAST activity had objectives that centered on improving the students' academic and vocational achievement levels. The activity also had objectives to improve the students' attendance and parent involvement.

Shop instructors rated the students at the beginning of the school year on cooperativeness, behavior, academic motivation, vocational motivation, quality of vocational work, and attendance. Students were given post-ratings on these same categories at the end of the school year. Pre-ratings indicated that of 530 participants, 36 to 40 percent were rated as very poor or poor; 38 percent were rated as average on all categories on pre-activity ratings.

BOAST pupils ratings at the end of the school year were significantly higher than their pre-ratings. Eighty five to 90 percent of the participants were rated as good or excellent in all categories.

BOAST pupils improved their fiscal 1979 attendance record from 81 percent in fiscal 1979 to 83 percent in fiscal 1980.

Although BOAST did not have reading or math objectives, ITBS test data on 361 BOAST participants were quite positive. Considering that BOAST pupils were serious underachievers, ITBS test results for fiscal 1980 were extremely positive. Overall, pupils achieved an 8 month grade-equivalent gain in reading comprehension exceeding fiscal 1979's 6.5 months gain. More BOAST pupils achieved a positive standard score gain in fiscal 1980 as compared to fiscal 1979, 66% and 54% respectively. In addition, participants generally showed positive achievement results in ITBS math concepts and problem solving.

Additional details of BOAST achievement can be found in Volume 2 of the Fiscal 1980 Title I Evaluation Report.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total fiscal 1980 BOAST activity cost was estimated at $564,447. The estimated per pupil cost based on serving over 700 students was about $780 per pupil.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Funding cutbacks in the BOAST activity caused a decrease in staff positions, materials, and supplies.

In spite of financial modifications, the BOAST activity was implemented with no serious problems and conducted by experienced staff.

Although BOAST participants were selected to participate because of poor attendance, academic achievement, and attitude toward the regular school setting, there were many positive changes in these areas.

It is interesting to note that the BOAST participants did not receive the "extra" formal reading program offered by other Title I activities, yet the achievement gains compare with or are higher than those in other Title I reading activities.

Parent involvement was average for a Title I activity. Indications were that parents were highly supportive put not very active.

The cost of the activity based on the expense and the positive results in almost every area measured show that the activity has improved over the years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- BOAST should be continued as a Title I activity for potential school dropouts.
- If possible, money should be expended to provide needed repairs for equipment and the purchase of materials.
- If possible money should be expended to provide necessary staff when needed.
- A formal supplementary reading component should be considered for BOAST to determine if even higher academic gains can be achieved for participants.
- Ways of further increasing pupil attendance should be investigated by BOAST staff.

R&E #58
Project #633
Program #7658
Evaluator: Joseph Schroeder

GUIDANCE FOR TITLE I ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

During fiscal 1980, its eighth year in Chicago's Title I project, 41 public and four private schools conducted the Guidance for Title I Elementary School Pupils (GESP) activity. Over 3,600 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils participated.

According to program guidelines, GESP provided each participating school with a teacher who met counselor requirements for the Chicago Board of Education. This resource guidance teacher provided assitance to a selected group of 70 to 80 eligible Title I pupils. Participants were referred by teachers who felt assistance by the guidance teacher might alleviate behavior problems in the classroom. Participants might include those who were overly aggressive, extremely shy, disliked by peers, listless, etc.

Because problems such as these sometimes originate outside the school environment, the guidance teacher was to schedule one half-day each week for individual or group counseling sessions with parents of participating pupils. Pupils received one 30- to 40-minute group counseling session per week.

Individual conferences with pupils were to be scheduled as needed. Confidential records or logs were kept. Work records and schedules were reported to the principal, district superintendent, and central office administrator on a regular basis.

Inservice was to be provided to guidance teachers at the beginning of the school year. During the year one half day every two months was scheduled for guidance inservice. This inservice was conducted by a central office coordinator and district coordinators assigned to the activity.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

The majority of schools conducting GESP had used the activity in previous years. Central Office records showed that regular reports were submitted by guidance teachers on weekly activities. Evaluators observed small group sessions being conducted in the spring and fall of 1980. Because of the nature of the activity individual conferences were not observed.

According to principals, the guidance activity was selected because of past successful experience in implementing and conducting the activity. During fiscal 1980 there were no serious problems implementing the GESP activity. Generally, services for Title I pupils, parents, and teachers began by October. This is the usual time each year for the activity guidance teachers to have received referrals from Title I teachers who noticed that certain children were in need of GESP service.

Although some principals and teachers reported not receiving supplies and/or materials on time, this did not deter the activity from beginning.

Staffing

The majority of GESP teachers had worked in GESP during previous years, and all met counselor requirements for the Chicago Board of Education. The majority of principals rated staff as very efficient. High ratings on meeting activity objectives were also noted for GESP staff by principals.

Inservice

The majority of the teachers rated the inservices as either "good" or "excellent." Staff conducting the inservices were district coordinators, central office staff, and local school staff. Topics of the inservices ranged from presentations of various techniques used in group counseling to the variety of materials teachers could use to introduce guidance ideas to pupils.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

During on-site observations schools scheduled to conduct the activity were noted to have a guidance teacher and room, usually a regular classroom or one large enough to conduct small group sessions. Most guidance teachers were observed instructing small groups in regular size classrooms. Some used rooms about one half the size of a regular room but which seemed to be adequate for small groups.

Generally, GESP rooms were neat and provided a pleasant environment for participants. In most schools the GESP room was observed to have a variety of counseling and guidance materials and audio-visual aids available or in use.

Participants

During fiscal 1980 GESP pupils in 33 classrooms were observed. It was noted during the observations that the majority of pupils were "on task" and attentive. This was a positive note considering that many participating pupils had exhibited behavior problems in the regular classroom. Pupils were being instructed mainly in whole class settings; most classes included five to eight participants. Teachers appeared to have excellent rapport with pupils. The individual counseling sessions offered to pupils as the need required were not observed due to the nature of the counseling process.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

As in past years many GESP teachers rated the parent component of the activity as the most difficult to implement and conduct. Although about 50 percent of the GESP teachers reported having successful parent involvement for most of the planned parent conferences, about half of the teachers indicated that many parents canceled or did not keep appointments for counseling conferences. Analysis of parent conference attendance rosters indicated that some teachers reported ratios of only 25 percent of the parents attending planned conferences.

Sixteen parents of GESP pupils responded to the Title I Parent Survey. The majority of these parents rated the activity as good or excellent and indicated that they better understood their child's needs and assisted them with their school work due to the GESP activity.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

Based mainly on responses from GESP teachers and comments by principals, the activity seemed to have a positive effect on most pupils' behavior in the school setting. In addition, Title I classroom visitations showed participants to be attending to tasks and having good rapport with the teachers.

Four of five regular classroom teachers responding to a questionnaire relating to pull-out Title I activities reported they supported GESP and thought it was an effective activity.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost for the GESP activity during fiscal 1980 was estimated at $1,252,505. The per pupil cost was $340. If one considers that pupils who exhibit emotional behavior problems usually do not achieve adequately in school, the GESP activity could be rated as a valuable supportive program related to the participants academic future.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The GESP activity was not a difficult activity to implement in most schools, providing qualified staff and a conference room were available. The need for this type of activity exists in any large urban school district, where complex community or family problems due to a variety of reasons including poverty influence a pupil's behavior.

The majority of GESP teachers were observed to have good rapport with participants and most participants seemed to be attentive and responsive to GESP instruction.

Parent involvement is usually necessary to modify or change negative behavior and attitudes of pupils. However, the parent component of the GESP activity continued to be weak as reported by teachers over the years.

Principals generally supported GESP staff and rated them highly. All of the teachers were experienced and had formal education in counseling and guidance. Based on the data received, the activity seemed to achieve some degree of success.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Plans to increase parent involvement in the GESP activity are necessary to improve activity effectiveness.

More inservice meetings to share successful techniques by teachers to involve parents in the activity should be promoted.

GESP has been assessed to be capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population and is recommended for continuation at schools where it is producing desired results.

R&E #28
Project #594
Program #7628
Evaluator: Joe Schroeder

FAMILY GUIDANCE CENTER

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Family Guidance Center (FGC) has been in operation as an ESEA Title I program since 1969. It has been located since its beginning at 1801 S. Ashland Avenue. The center is staffed by Chicago Board of Education personnel with expertise in counseling.

The staff, which included one coordinating counselor, five teacher counselors, and a school psychologist, provided counseling for eligible Title I pupils who were considered by their principals, teachers, and parents as potential socially maladjusted children. A consulting psychiatrist served as resource for staff on a consulting basis two afternoons each week and provided pyschiatric and referral services to pupils having special or unique problems. In addition, FGC staff provided participant families with counseling, crisis intervention, and psychological evaluation.

In fiscal 1980, it was expected that about 400 elementary school pupils and their families would be served. The majority of the participants were to be referred by Title I public schools and about one fourth were to be referred by parochial schools serving eligible Title I pupils.

As in past years, a participant was expected to attend at least 12 sessions. Depending on the severity of the child's problem, the duration of counseling sessions numbered from one through forty. In some instances referrals were listed as "no shows" either because the parents would not attend with the child or they transferred out of the attendance area.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Participants

Figures from the FGC regarding services rendered indicated that 266 pupils ranging from age 6 to age 14 were referred for and received counseling services. In addition, 85 pupils continued in counseling from fiscal 1979 for a total of 351 participants. Forty-seven pupils were dropped after receiving from one to three conferences because parents failed to attend. Sixty-four pupils who were referred by school staff never began FGC services and were recorded as "no shows." Counseling services were terminated for 170 pupils who satisfactorily completed counseling. It is important to note that in addition to counseling the pupil, it is mandatory that at least one parent accompany the pupil to each counseling session. In the majority of cases the pupil's siblings participated to some degree.

Staff

The FGC staff, all of whom were formally educated and experienced counselors, had no problems implementing the activity at the beginning of the year. Three of the six counselors had about 10 years of FGC experience, one about eight years and two had been with the center for two years. The school psychologist assigned to FGC had also been with the center for about 10 years. On-site visitation during fiscal 1980 indicated that the center was well organized and staffed with enthusiastic personnel who took their profession seriously. All counselors expressed concern for participants who would not be able to continue counseling services due to the closing of the FGC for the summer. This was the first time since the beginning of FGC that this type of interruption occurred. The FGC was also closed for two weeks in January.

Inservice

Observation of three of the scheduled weekly inservice meetings conducted by the coordinator or psychiatrist showed that a team work approach was utilized to attempt to solve a pupils' problems. The psychiatrist, psychologist, or coordinating counselor was the leader of these meetings.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facility and Operation

The facility provided privacy for pupils and parents receiving individualized counseling. The reception room, play room, and counseling offices had been decorated by FGC staff to provide a pleasant environment for pupils and their families. The operation had been improved with a modified screening procedure for referral which helped to reduce the number of "no shows". Staff had also increased their "visibility" to eligible Title I schools by participating at various school inservices and orientation meetings to provide insight to teachers of children who may have been exhibiting behavior and emotional problems.

Activity Effectiveness

The FGC evaluation objectives centered on modifying the behavior of participants to a positive degree and alleviating emotional stress.

To determine the degree of success, results of three questionnaires were analyzed. Counselors completed a Counselor Questionnaire for each participant upon termination of the counseling sessions. Parents of participating pupils were asked to complete the Adult Adult Questionnaire of Termination after counseling services were complete. In addition, a School Questionnaire was sent to the pupil's school four to five weeks after counseling was terminated to determine the "staying" affect of FGC counseling on each participant.

Each questionnaire included a "no problem" response to indicate that a particular item was not a problem for the pupil. The significant ratings were "improved," "same," and "worse."

TABLE 1. COUNSELOR RATINGS OF PUPILS' PROGRESS (N = 175)

ITEM	IMPROVED		SAME		WORSE		NO PROBLEMS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
-School behavior	99	57	69	39	0	-	7	4
-School attendance	9	5	56	32	1	1	109	62
-Attitude toward school	96	55	60	34	0	-	19	11
-Willingness to cooperate	95	54	49	28	2	1	29	17
-Willingness to listen	96	55	47	27		-	32	18
-School progress	80	46	89	50	1	1	5	3
-Parent's willingness to cooperate	31	18	74	42	8	5	62	35

As shown in Table 1, counselors indicated that the majority of pupils improved in all items except school attendance. It is also evident in Table 1 that FGC had little affect on "parent's willingness to cooperate" for those parents who displayed negative attitudes. During counseling, very few participants demonstrated "worse" behavior according to counselors.

The results of the School Questionnaire shown in Table 2 may be the most objective and meaningful data to determine any activity effect. Most responses were obtained from the pupil's teacher, who had no special interest in the center or "family" interest in the pupil. The majority of school respondents indicated improvement in school behavior, in willingness to cooperate, and willingness to listen. Fewer teachers rated FGC participants as improved in other categories as shown in Table 2. Parents' willingness to cooperate was a problem also. In addition to the ratings shown in Table 2, teachers reported that 63 percent of the 115 FGC participants generally improved; 32 percent did not improve; and for 5 percent improvement could not be judged.

TABLE 2. TEACHERS' RATINGS OF PUPILS COMPLETING FGC SESSIONS (N=115)

ITEM	IMPROVED		SAME		WORSE		NO PROBLEMS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
-School behavior	59	51	45	39	5	4	6	6
-School attendance	24	21	35	30	4	4	52	45
-Attitude toward school	48	42	50	43	5	4	13	11
-Willingness to cooperate	56	49	37	32	12	10	10	9
-Willingness to listen	58	50	40	35	12	10	5	5
-School progress	43	37	56	49	9	7	8	7
-Parents' willingness to cooperate	26	23	45	39	2	3	40	35

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Seventy-eight parents completed and returned the Adult Questionnaire of Termination. Table 3 shows that the majority of parents indicated improvement in their children's attitudes toward all items rated. Significant improvement can be noted in the children's home behavior, attitude toward parents, and willingness to cooperate and listen.

TABLE 3. PARENTS' RATING OF PUPILS COMPLETING FGC SESSIONS (N= 78)

ITEM	IMPROVED		SAME		WORSE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
-Child's home behavior	60	77	16	19	2	4
-Child's attitude toward parents	55	70	21	27	2	3
-Child's attitude toward brothers and sisters	41	59	28	40	1	1
-Child's attitude toward school	56	72	21	26.5	1	1.5
-Child's attitude to cooperate with parents	55	70.5	20	25	3	4.5
-Child's willingness to listen	55	70.5	22	28	1	1.5

The great majority of parents also reported a general improvement in the child due to counseling. Most parents agreed that FGC services were helpful to the whole family.

In spite of the fact that data indicated that the FGC did provide assistance and improved the attitude of about 50% of the participants across all categories rated, the activity did not meet the objectives requiring improvement for 75% of the participants. An exception to this is the 88% percent response that indicated general improvement in the child as reported by parents.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of FGC projected on a 10.25 month basis for fiscal 1980 was approximately $253,280. The Title I cost, less a state reimbursement of $48,750, was projected at $204,540. Although 400 pupils were referred to counseling, about 350 actually received counseling. It is difficult to determine the hourly cost per pupil because of the difference in the number of sessions each pupil attends. It should be noted that participants changed during the year, some participating for as long as 40 weeks, others for as few as two. One may estimate the per pupil cost by dividing the number of pupils into the total Title I cost. FGC per pupil cost would be about $586.

However, the nature of the activity demands counseling not only for the pupil but for the parent, and, if needed, siblings also. Based on an average time of 20 hours of counseling for each pupil and family, the cost per counseling hour was $29.50. In determining activity effectiveness in this light, one must also consider staffings on individual participants, orientation meetings provided to eligible Title I school staffs, and follow-up on pupils in need.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

It appears that FGC provides staff and counseling service that was beneficial to teachers, pupils, and parents who had need of this service. Providing services to improve mental health and alleviate emotional stress is complex in nature and required an abundance of time and money for each pupil served. However, anyone familiar with the problems that one experiences in dealing with mental health, guidance, or counseling procedures is aware of the high cost for servicing small numbers of people in need.

Visiting the FGC, observing staff and participant families, and analyzing FGC records and evaluation instruments all showed that this service was needed in the Chicago school system. The types of pupil problems served ranged from emotional and physical child neglect which interferes with successful school achievement to other emotional disorders that do not allow pupils to behave properly in a classroom setting.

Although FGC did not meet expectations in regard to the percent of pupils showing improvement, positive results were noted for the majority of participants by counselors, teachers, and parents.

Considering that participants as well as FGC staff had breaks in continuity of service due to a closing of school during the winter and the premature cancellation of extended counseling during the summer months, some degree of success was evident.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on evaluation findings during fiscal 1980, it is recommended that:

- FGC services be continued to serve eligible Title I pupils in need.

- Continued efforts be taken to make it easier for parents to attend sessions. (This may mean more flexible hours and increased travel allowance for parents.)

- Continued and increased communication between FGC staff and sending school staff take place.

- A program to follow up with FGC services at the sending school after the pupil terminates FGC service should be developed.

R&E #18
Project #574
Program #2117
Evaluator: John Brunetti

FIELD EXPERIENCES

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Field Experiences (FE) provided occasions for children to familiarize themselves with community resources. It was to promote constructive use of leisure time and expand the pupils' awareness of possible career opportunities. It supplemented the educational program through enrichment of the pupils' experiential background and was to stimulate follow-up activities in many curriculum areas. It was a supportive service for selected pupils participating in Title I instructional programs in eligible public and non-public schools.

The activity provided buses to transport children and funds to pay required admission fees to various cultural events, educational institutions, and industries. Parents participated in this activity by serving as volunteer aides on field trips.

The Field Experiences activity utilized the services and facilities of the many cultural, civic, and vocational resources of the city and its environs to enrich pupil backgrounds and supplement major subject areas in the classroom.

FE was purchased by 167 public and 57 nonpublic schools in fiscal 1980. It was to serve 35,726 kindergarten, primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils. No staff personnel were funded for this activity. Principals and Title I teachers were responsible for the planning and coordination of field trips. In self-contained activities, classroom teachers were responsible for instruction and pupil activities associated with each field trip.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

In fiscal 1980, FE was implemented without hindrance. Principals did not indicate any problems in implementing this activity. Higher frequencies of trips were noted in the fall and spring when the climate was more amenable to outdoor activities with children. Fewer trips were reported on the Teacher Evaluation Form for the winter months. Title I activity teachers were responsible for instruction and pupil activities associated with each class group's trip.

Over 5,000 buses and a total of over 1,500 teachers implemented this activity. Teacher aides and parents also accompanied the pupils on the trips.

Pupil identification and selection seemed to pose no problems. FE participants were pupils who participated in Title I reading and mathematics instructional activities. The actual selection of pupils generally followed the criteria set down in the guidelines.

Principals commented that to extend children's vocabulary and increase their language proficiency, field trips were encouraged for children of non-English-speaking backgrounds enrolled in Title I.

Inservice

Local school and district coordinators presented short suggestions in the way of inservice recommendations in many districts. At times, the local school Title I coordinator worked with the Title I teachers on field trips as a group coordinator.

Two principals commented that some of the more inexperienced teachers should have had structured field trips under the direction of a more experienced teacher. This would have helped to prevent mishaps or spontaneous trips that arose unrelated to class experiences. Also, it would have provided training in conducting pupils properly during excursions.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

In fiscal 1980, 759 Teacher Evaluation Forms were returned from teachers in the participating schools. Following is a sample of the sites they visited:

Architectural sites included:

- Sholom Temple
- John Hancock Plaza
- Chicago Water Tower
- Brunswick and Daley Plazas
- The tour of Chicago
- Woodfield Mall
- Bahai Temple
- Water Tower Place
- Sears Tower
- A working wind mill
- Dirksen Federal Building

Performing arts visits included:

- Improvisational theatre
- Folkloric Ballet of Cuban Dance
- Puppet Theatres
- Children's Theatre
- Adult plays
- A roller rink performance
- Performance by Ella Jenkins, a folk singer
- Circuses

Health related sites included:

- Rush-Presbyterian Medical Center
- Hinsdale Health Center
- A nursing convalescent center
- Lambs' Farm for the Adult Retarded

Education opportunity sites included:

- Triton College
- The University of Chicago
- Northeastern Illinois University

Other sites visited included museums, aquariums, zoos, farms, natural history centers, the planetarium, and synagogues.

The sites selected by the teachers were predominantly related to possible vocational interests for children growing up in an urban setting. Only eight sites had little or no vocational relationship. An activity objective required that FE would increase pupils' awareness of vocations and careers.

About 80 percent of the sites were selected by teachers in areas of vocational interest and awareness of career opportunities. These participating teachers exceeded the 75 percent criteria for meeting this objective. Sites chosen for specific rather than general vocational awareness included the following firms and work sites:

- Schwinn Bicycle Company
- Quaker Oats Company
- The courts at Daley Center
- The Chicago Sun Times Newspaper
- WVON radio station
- Fire stations
- Police stations
- The main post office
- The water filtration plant
- O'Hare International Airport

The evaluation forms also collected data on the teachers' specific trips. More than half of the responding teachers wished to revisit the specific field excursion sites, indicating that sites selected were instructional and of interest to teachers and pupils.

A sample of 150 Teacher Evaluation Forms was analyzed. More than 50 percent of the teachers indicated they presented follow-up activities upon returning to the school after a field trip. The kinds of follow-up activities included: 147 teachers discussed reactions to what the class saw; 81 did art work; 61 read stories to the children; 79 started social studies activities or projects; 109 used experience charts to increase vocabulary; 61 used reference books; 123 said pupils wrote stories, poems, or essays; and 78 assigned books or stories related to the visit.

Only three trips occurred outside of the Chicago metropolitan area. These were at distances that could be reached by bus so that children could go and return on the same day. One group visited the Wisconsin Dells Nature Area. Very few children attended motion pictures, baseball, or other sports events as in past years.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The parent objective required that at least 60 percent of the parents of participating pupils would indicate their children used their leisure time more constructively as a result of this activity. This objective was met. Approximately 82 percent of the parents responding to a Parent Questionnaire stated that their children who participated in this activity made better use of their leisure time. About 11 percent reported a negative response and about six percent responded that they did not know. Parent Advisory Councils in the local schools discussed field trips at meetings held in conjunction with school personnel. Many parents voluntarily accompanied very young pupils on trips. Principals were pleased to receive this support.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total budgeted costs for the activity was $334,511. Average per pupil cost was nine dollars. Dollar amounts were allocated to the schools at the rate of $10 per child for transportation and $7 per child for admission fees. Of the 224 schools which purchased the activity, 175 selected transportation only, and 49 selected bus monies selected transportation only, and 49 selected bus monies and entry fees. The activity coordinator, who reviewed expenditure forms, stated that at the close of the year only 70 percent of the monies for transportation and admissions had been expended. Some schools had under-purchased or trips had been cancelled due to unforeseen events such as storms or other inclement weather, emergencies, etc. No teachers, aides, or parent volunteers received monetary compensation.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FE accomplished its main purpose or objective. The activity provided sufficient funds for transportation and for admission fees to selected cultural events. Funds were allocated to school on the basis of local schools' determination of needs of pupils for Field Experience.

After each trip, teachers made recommendations on how the activity could be improved. Many teachers stated that more information concerning what the children will observe at the site should be included in informational packets distributed to teachers.

More than ten teachers stated that a tour guide should have been available in places where exhibits were detailed and complex. Twelve teachers recommended that cursory tours or walk-throughs should be avoided and concentration should be on some specific exhibit, preferably with some professional discussion. A few principals stated that the activity was to be discontinued in their schools for lack of auxiliary personnel for trip organization and proper pupil safety.

R&E #27
Project #593
Program #7627
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

OUTDOOR EDUCATION AND CAMPING

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Outdoor Education and Camping (OEC), a Title I activity since 1967, provided a coeducational outdoor education and camping program for public and nonpublic school pupils in the first through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. This five-day camp experience was correlated with the school program but was significantly modified to allow pupils to apply classroom learning to outdoor experience. Special activities were also offered to the pupils; examples are tours and visits to farms and lake areas for fishing. The children also learned about the care and feeding of animals.

The major purposes of the OEC activity centered on the following needs: (a) to help the child develop a positive attitude towards school; (b) to improve the child's social skills; (c) to involve the parents in the school program; and (d) to encourage constructive use of the child's leisure time.

ACTIVITY MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

Program Selection and Implementation

During the 1979-80 school year, a total of 107 public and 21 private schools selected OEC for some 8,000 pupils. Three campsites were used for this purpose. They were Camp Makisabee (Eau Claire, Michigan), Camp Hastings, and Camp Ravenswood (both in Lake Villa, Illinois). From all indications, the OEC activity was implemented on time and schools were able to visit camp according to schedule.

Staffing

Four-hundred-four teachers and 379 teacher aides accompanied the Title I pupils to camp. At each camp a team of resident staff augmented the home school staff. The resident staff included a camp coordinator, a medical nurse, a guidance counselor, a naturalist, a physical education teacher, camp aides, and kitchen staff. For the most part, the teachers who went to camp taught in a Title I activity at the home school. There were instances, however, where schools did send some teachers who were not associated with Title I activities. Unlike the teachers, all the teacher aides and most of the parent volunteers who went to camp were those who assisted in a Title I classroom at the home school. A few parents, however, volunteered their services just for the duration of the camp week.

In addition to the professional staff and the parent volunteers, a group of high school students accompanied the Title I pupils to serve as junior cabin counselors. These students were usually carefully selected by their respective public or nonpublic high school counselor.

Inservice

Pre-camp inservice training was provided to all teachers, teacher aides, parent volunteers, and cabin volunteers who were selected to go to camp. These training workshops were arranged and managed by the resident and city camp coordinators, assisted by the rest of the resident camp team. Training workshops for the professional staff were held at camp while those for the cabin counselors were held at the local public school.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

In order to bring about the desired outcomes of the Outdoor Education and Camping activity, both formal and informal learning experiences were organized for the pupils.

The formal learning environment at camp was characterized as follows. The setting was frequently in a regular classroom, a commons area, or the outdoors. The subject matter most often centered on science, particularly environmental science or ecology, and star study. Mathematics, social studies, and craft work were also presented on occasion. Reading and writing skills were exercised or taught in conjunction with the subject matter at hand. Predominant instruction techniques included explaining, showing by guiding, questioning, demonstrating, or checking work. Students learned primarily by listening, observing, manipulating, handling, writing, or interacting with teachers and other students. Materials used for instruction purposes often included the following: science equipment, writing paper, animals and plants, chalkboard, manipulatives, worksheets, arts and crafts materials, record players, overhead and movie projectors, tape recorders, microscopes, and other projecting or listening devices.

The classroom climate was often noisy but pupils were attentive to tasks. The setting for informal learning experiences was frequently a commons area, a playground, swimming pool, lake, or the open fields. In these informal settings, the learning experiences provided were often social in nature: dancing, play acting, music or rhythm, art appreciation, or physical excercises.

Camp Program

At each center, the camp coordinator directed the total camp program. The naturalist rendered needed assistance to the home school teacher in the sciences and applied mathematics curricula. The physical education teacher coordinated the recreation program. The registered nurse took care of all health problems. The camp aides assisted in all aspects of photography and nature studies. Food services were provided by the kitchen staff.

Program Cost

During the 1979-80 school year, the Outdoor Education and Camping activity cost an average of $203 per pupil, or a total of $1,630,132 for 8,014 pupils.

ACTIVITY EFFECTIVENESS

Table 1 shows that a total of 80 principals evaluated the activity in five areas. Principals rated five aspects of the activity on a three-point scale, with three being "very effective."

TABLE 1. PRINCIPAL'S RATINGS OF OEC (N=80)

Item	Rating
Meeting Objectives	2.8
Staff	2.8
Inservice	2.7
Materials	2.7
Equipment	2.7

The ratings indicate that principals considered the effectiveness of the OEC to be above average in serving the needs for which it was designed. The staff assigned to the activity and the quality of inservice meetings, materials, and equipment were all given high marks.

In response to a staff questionnaire, the resident camp personnel felt the strengths of the Outdoor Education and Camping activity to be primarily as follows: (1) the activity provided pupils unique educational experiences not usually available at the home-school; (2) the activity improved school-community relations and school involvement on the part of parents; and (3) the activity kindled or enhanced interest in learning on the part of pupils.

The ten camp personnel who responded to the staff survey cited incidences of problems in operating the OEC activity. These were: (1) difficulties in scheduling either inservice meetings, medical examinations for the pupils, or dates for individual schools to be at camp; (2) difficulties in obtaining cooperation from the local school staff, in some instances; and (3) difficulties in obtaining sufficient numbers of pupils to participate in the program. Such difficulties, however, were considered to be minor in comparison to the benefits derived from the activity.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

One of the needs for which the Outdoor Education and Camping activity was designed was to involve parents in the educational program of their children. The extent to which this need was met may be inferred from the responses of parents to the Parent Questionnaire administered to a sample of all parents in all Title I activities. A total of 30 parents responded to items dealing with OEC. Over seventy percent of the parents believed their child made better progress in fiscal 1980 than in previous years, and 90 percent of the parents recommended the activity be continued in the future. The overall effectivenss of the Outdoor Education and Camping activity was believed to be either excellent or good by the majority of parents who responded to the parent survey.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Outdoor Education and Camping was probably beneficial to many of its participants. Principals, staff, and parents all considered the activity to be a worthwhile educational endeavor. The major benefit of the activity appeared to be that it provided unique educational experiences and hence kindled or enhanced an interest in learning on the part of pupils. An additional strength of the activity was related to school-community relations. The evidence indicates that the OEC activity promoted a climate in which communications between the home and the school were established or improved for many of the project's participants.

A weakness of OEC was related to the cost of the activity. The $200 per pupil cost to the school for just one week of outdoor education may be hard to justify by some schools faced with unmet needs in the major curriculum areas. One solution would be to consider cutting back the number of adult personnel, teachers, teacher aides, and parents each school sends to accompany Title I pupils to camp. Most of the educational experiences provided to pupils at camp can be managed by the resident camp staff, who are better prepared than the home school teachers to present lessons on the outdoor education.

With a reduced number of school-based personnel going to camp, savings in funds would be realized in a number of ways such as: (a) reduced costs for inservice training; (b) reduced weekly stipends provided to teachers at camp; (c) reduction in the number of replacements for these teachers while they are at camp. The fear that a pupil's home school curriculum would be interrupted if the pupil's own teachers did not accompany him to camp does not need to arise since in the past there has been little evidence to indicate continuity between the lessons provided at school and those at camp. Most of the instructional objectives at camp seem to be related to those of the home school only in a peripheral way. Nevertheless, the activity is still considered by many to be a success.

R&E #48
Project #613
Program #3480
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

HEALTH SERVICES

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Health Services activity was designed as a supportive project for selected public and non-public school children who were in preschool through the eighth year of school beyond kindergarten and who participated in a Title I instructional project.

The project operated in coordination with and supplemented the services of the board-funded health program by providing medical examinations and evaluation, dental and visual screening, referral and follow-up of medical and dental problems, and parental consultations and conferences with school staff concerning findings and procedures for follow-up services. Educational materials were also available for distribution to pupils.

The purpose of the Health Services activity was to help school staff and parents identify any major health problems which might affect pupils' academic achievement. Pupils requiring treatment were to be referred to the appropriate medical and dental personnel. The specific objectives to be met by this activity were specified as follows: (a) the need to involve parents in the school program, (b) the need to encourage pupils to seek medical advice, and (c) the need to encourage pupils to seek treatment for health problems.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

In the 1979-80 school year, 36 public and 27 private schools purchased the activity. A health team consisting of 1.5 physicians, 1 medical lab technician, 3 health aides, 3 public health nurses, 3 school nurses, and 1 principal clerk visited sites scattered across the city.

An analysis of records provided by the Bureau of Medical and School Health Services indicated that 4,211 pupils were referred to the medical team for health examinations. Eighty-nine percent were found to have a number of health problems. A total of 9,191 problems, an average of two to three per pupil, were detected. The most common problems were impaired vision, found in 14 percent of all cases;

nutritional deficiences, 10 percent; ear and hearing defects, 10 percent; skin problems, 9 percent; and heart murmurs, 7 percent. Table 1 presents a complete breakdown.

TABLE 1. TYPES OF HEALTH PROBLEMS FOUND (N=9191)

Asthma	201	2.2
Hayfever	17	0.2
Birth Defects	134	1.5
Anemia (under 11 gr. Hb)	30	0.3
High Blood Pressure	18	0.2
Heart Murmurs, Functional	476	5.2
Heart Murmurs, Organic	24	0.3
Bones (joints, muscles)	179	2.0
Dental	1187	12.9
Ear and Hearing	895	9.7
Eye and Vision	1311	14.3
Diabetes and Endocrine	13	0.1
Gastrointestinal	32	0.3
Genito-urinary	116	1.3
Hernias	386	4.2
Learning Disabilities	8	0.1
Bronchitis	7	0.1
Epilepsy	25	0.3
Nutritional	933	10.2
Skin	830	9.0
Speech	183	2.0
Sickel Cell: Positive	266	2.9
Urinalysis: Abnormal	251	2.7
Other	1669	18.2

A significant number of the pupils were given immunizations for polio, measles, rubella, and other diseases. The number of pupils who were treated for health defects identified through the medical examinations remains unknown although 2,263 were referred for further treatment.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The extent to which parents through the Health Services activity were involved in the school program may be inferred from responses to the Parent Questionnaire. This instrument was sent to a random sample of parents of all Title I pupils. Eight parents responded to items dealing with the Health Services activity. Six of the eight respondents indicated that they were aware of the participation by their child in the Health Services activity; they themselves had visited the school to see the activity in operation. Seven of the parents responded favorably to the question of whether Health Services should be continued in the future. Based on a limited number of responses, it appears the 90 percent objective for parental awareness of the activity was probably not attained.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Probably the major strength of the Health Services activity lies in the provision of a medical team for the purpose of on-site diagnosis of health defects which could possibly be a factor associated with slow academic progress among Title I pupils. The high rate of Title I pupils with health defects (89 percent) justified operation of the activity. Additional beneficial effects of Health Services are believed to be improved attitudes towards school on the part of pupils, providing pupils with a supplemental health education program, and developing pupils' awareness that school officials are concerned with their physical well-being. These conclusions are based on comments made by activity personnel in response to a staff questionnaire at the end of the school year.

A disturbing aspect of the Health Services project lies in the lack of knowledge of the extent to which children diagnosed to have health defects actually received the required treatment. Health records maintained by the Medical Team seem to yield very little information with respect to the proportion of pupils receiving treatment after referral.

Health Services activity identified physical defects among 89 percent of the pupils examined. Thus an important objective of the project, to identify and refer health problems for treatment, may have been achieved. The team also provided supplemental health education to participants and those parents who accompanied their children.

The weakness of the activity has been the apparent failure to maintain a vigorous follow-up program to insure that pupils referred for treatment receive the required treatment. If the paramount objective of the project is to improve the learning capacity of youngsters limited by some health problem, it behooves those concerned to see that pupils do receive the necessary medical attention.

It is recommended that the Health Services activity be continued as a component of the educational program of Title I pupils.

R&E #32
Project #598
Program #8320
Evaluator: Joseph Schroeder

SCHOOL COMMUNITY IDENTIFICATION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980, 195 public and 34 private schools conducted the School Community Identification (SCI) activity. This was SCI's 14th year in the Chicago Title I project. Approximately 25,000 pupils participated in the activity.

School Community Representatives (SCRs) were paraprofessionals working under the direct supervision of the principal. Their function was to foster closer relationships between teachers and parents of Title I pupils. A full-time SCR was to provide support services to 70 pupils who were participants in a Title I activity. A half-time SCR was to provide services for 35 eligible pupils. Schools purchasing this activity also had the option of purchasing a dissemination component which provided funds for the printing of brochures and pamphlets which school staff and the school advisory council felt would inform the parents.

SCRs were expected to visit homes of the participating pupils every two months to establish and foster a closer relationship between home and school. Other tasks included contact by telephone, classroom visitations, referring parents to appropriate social agencies, and sponsoring workshops to show parents how they could help their children develop positive attitudes toward learning. The SCR was expected to maintain a daily log of activities on the standard log form and to submit monthly reports on activities to the principal and district superintendent. SCRs were to receive inservice one half-day each month from district coordinators.

Generally, staff--especially principals--indicated a favorable attitude toward this activity. Title I schools have repeatedly purchased this activity and observation of some of the inservices during fiscal 1980 showed that district coordinators were monitoring SCRs and providing expertise in areas of management, human relations, and problem solving.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

During on-site visitations by field evaluators, it was noted that Title I schools did have the SCI activity in operation. Depending on the Title I pupil population, one half-time to four full-time SCRs were on duty. Informal observation at schools indicated that the SCR did maintain a list of Title I participants and a log book of activities.

Staffing

Two hundred thirty six SCR's in 150 public schools responded to the 1980 Title I SCR Questionnaire. Generally, SCRs were experienced, the majority reporting having 10 years experience in the activity.

SCRs reported having a variety of tasks. These included contacting parents on pupil attendance or school behavior, assisting teachers with pupils, acting as liaison between the school and home, informing parents of Title I activities, dealing with pupil health problems, and referring parents in need of assistance to various agencies.

Inservice

Based on the schedules submitted to district coordinators and on observations of two SCR inservice meetings, it was evident that monthly inservice meetings took place to provide activity staff with support.

SCRs rated inservice meetings and listed the approximate number and type they attended through the year. Meetings were rated on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being poor and 4 being excellent. The average rating was over three which approaches excellent. The staff conducting the majority of meetings were district coordinators and local school staff such as SCRs, teachers, and principals. In addition, central office administrators and district administrators conducted inservice meetings. All staff conducting the inservices were rated highly by SCRs.

Facilities and Operation

Ninety percent of the SCR's reported that they had adequate working space. During on-site observation of Title I classrooms it was evident that most SCRs either shared a regular size classroom with one or two other non-instructional staff or had a smaller room to conduct daily activities. The 10 percent reporting they did not have adequate working space were those who shared desk space in the main office of a school. Some SCRs indicated that they needed more privacy.

During informal visits to the SCRs' offices supplemented by district coordinators' and central office administrators' records, it was determined that SCRs kept a log of daily activities. Full-time SCRs had 70 pupils assigned to them for follow-up and also kept records of meetings with parents. All of the SCRs worked under the supervision of the principal.

The great majority of SCR respondents (97 percent) indicated that the principal had confidence in them and 87 percent thought they had enough responsibilities. As for working with teachers, 94 percent of the SCRs felt "comfortable." Time spent working directly with pupils varied: 39 percent of the SCRs reported they spent from 25 to 50 percent of their time in work directly related to pupils; 32 percent indicated that they spent more than 50 percent of their time working with pupils; and less than 25 percent of working time spent with pupils was reported by 29 percent of the SCRs.

ACTIVITY EFFECTIVENESS

Two evaluation objectives applied to SCI in fiscal 1980:

> At least 75 percent of the Title I teachers at schools participating in this activity will indicate increased awareness of the home situation and the instructional needs of their pupils as a result of this activity.
>
> At least 80 percent of the participating parents will better understand their children's needs and be more able to assist them in their education at home as a result of this activity.

Over 800 Title I teachers responded to an item on the Title I Teacher Questionnaire that assisted in measuring the first objective. Table I shows the frequency and type of responses to whether or not the teachers felt they were more aware of their pupils home situation and instructional needs because of the SCI activity.

TABLE 1. TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF SCI

Question	Percent	Number
Teachers Had Greater Awareness Of Pupils' Home Situations:		
-Yes	64	531
-Not Sure	19	160
-No	17	146
Teachers Had Greater Awareness of Pupils' Instructional Needs:		
-Yes	57	472
-Not Sure	22	178
-No	21	176

Based on teacher opinion, it was obvious that SCI did not meet the objective related to teachers. It is interesting to note, however, that principals responding to the Principal Evaluation Form provided more favorable results. Table 2 shows the ratings by principals of SCI for "meeting objectives" and "staff."

TABLE 2. RATING OF SCRS BY PRINCIPALS

Rating	Meeting Objectives		Staff	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Efficient	103	76	106	81
Average	29	21	23	18
Inefficient	4	3	2	2

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Over 1,000 parents of Title I pupils responded to the Title I Parent Questionnaire. Of these parents only 22 indicated that they were aware of the SCI activity. The majority of the few parents responding on SCI indicated that they were in favor of seeing the activity continued and that their children were achieving more because of the SCI activity.

SCRs reported on the SCR Questionnaire that they helped parents whenever possible by conducting parent meetings, providing sewing and craft classes, assisting in referring parents in need to various social agencies, and sponsoring clothing collections for pupils in need of clothing.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of SCI during fiscal 1980 was $4,797,560. The number of pupils served was approximately 25,000. The per pupil cost to conduct this activity during fiscal 1980 was $191. Based on the high ratings of principals who supervised SCRs and SCR tasks related to improving communication between the school and parents, the cost of the activity may be considered reasonable.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

Evaluation findings indicated that the SCRs were generally experienced staff conducting a variety of socially oriented activities in Title I Schools.

There is evidence that principals thought the service provided by SCI staff was effective and valuable. The majority of SCRs reported that they felt their principals had confidence in them in relation to their tasks.

The majority of the SCRs attended monthly inservice meetings designed to assist them in carrying out their duties. Although the majority of teachers reported favorably on SCRs assisting them with pupils in need, a lower percentage of teachers reported favorably on SCI than did principals.

Data from parents was positive though too limited to ascertain whether the SCRs were performing a valuable service in relation to parents needs. The majority of principals claimed that the SCRs were indeed actively involved with parents of Title I pupils.

Considering the number of years principals have selected the activity and the nature of the SCRs' duties, one can assume the activity had merit. There is evidence, however, that the activity could be strengthened in certain areas to be more effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The School Community Identification program should be continued with the following modifications:

-District coordinators or others concerned with providing inservice to SCRs should emphasize tasks that enhance the relationship between the SCR and teacher.

-Programs should be developed within the SCI activity that allow more parents to become aware and involved.

-Highly rated, experienced SCRs should be given an opportunity to share their techniques and procedures with other SCRs, across districts if necessary.

-Schedules of time allotments for particular SCR tasks should be as comprehensive as daily schedules are for teachers.

R&E #62
Project #612
Program #7698
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

PARENT PLUS PROJECT

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

During fiscal 1980, its second year of operation in Title I, ten public schools purchased the Parent Plus Project (PPP) for 540 parents and an equivalent number of pupils. A total of nine full-time equivalent teachers and ten teacher aides were assigned to implement the activity in the various schools.

The Parent Plus Activity was designed to provide cooperative learning sessions at home for parents and their children. Pupils received four 10-week activity packets to be done at home; the parents were expected to spend one hour each week helping their children with the learning activities which were based on the basal reading and mathematics textbooks currently in use at their school.

In addition to the weekly home sessions, the parents were to meet at school in small groups for an equivalent of four full days each month with a teacher. The intent of the meetings was to study and discuss various aspects of child development and engage in homemaking, health and nutrition, modern mathematics, consumer education, crafts and sewing activities. The teacher was expected also to work with the parents on topics related to the academic needs of their children in such areas as word-attack skills, basic mathematics techniques, language expression, comprehension, phonetic analysis, and related skills necessary for parents to work more effectively with the children.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENMT

Initiation of Instruction

From all indications, it appears that the schools were able to implement the Parent Plus activity without significant delays. Teachers who responded to the Teacher Questionnaire indicated that they had managed to select participants for their classes and begun scheduling school activities for the parents by the beginning of the fourth week of school, September 24th. By that date, the necessary instructional materials and other supplies had been received. Many of these materials and supplies were rated good or excellent by the surveyed teachers. The materials were also considered to be adequate for the needs of the teachers.

Inservice

In order to ensure the effectiveness of the Parent Plus Project, a number of inservice training workshops were held for the teachers. These inservice meetings were presented by the activity vendor. Some were also presented by district and central office personnel. In isolated instances, inservice meetings were arranged by the local school staff. Teachers who attended the inservice meetings considered them to have been good or very good. This conclusion is limited, however, in that only a third of the activity teachers returned the Teacher Questionnaire.

Instruction

During visits to activity classes, it was observed that teachers worked with parents in a variety of activities. Although these activities included reading excercises to be done at home with their children, many times teachers engaged the parents in other activities presumably intended to improve the quality of home life of Title I pupils. Activities falling in this category included better ways of preparing meals and effective techniques for mending and making clothes. From time to time field trips were arranged to acquaint parents with the cultural and educational enrichment centers of the city.

Staff Roles

While the role of the teacher encompassed all aspects of the implementation and management of PPP, the role of the teacher aide appeared to be supportive and supplemental in nature. The teacher aide's role was to assist the teacher with the evaluation of pupils' at-home work, preparation of classroom displays, and preparation of materials needed for parents in school activities.

Program Cost

An analysis of budget records indicates that in fiscal 1980, the Parent Plus Project per pupil cost was $691 with a total cost of $373,009.

ACTIVITY EFFECTIVENESS

Parent Involvement

The major strength of this activity appears to be its potential for involving parents in the education of their children. Although other forms of parent involvement activities may focus on the same objective, the Parent Plus Project appears to be unique in that provision was made for pupils and parents to participate as a team. This arrangement seems to have two main advantages: (1) it increases the likelihood that pupils will receive help at home in their effort to learn, and (2) it fosters continuing communication between the home and the school.

The extent to which the advantages of the Parent Plus Project was indicated by questionnaires returned by parents and school staff. Teachers who returned the Teacher Questionnaire noted the activity to be either moderately or very effective. In response to a supplemental questionnaire, six out of seven teachers felt the Parent Plus Project: (a) improved attitudes towards school on the part of pupils, (b) helped parents to better understand their children's educational needs, and (c) generated interest in learning. The teachers also believed that the majority of parents (88 percent) and of pupils (85 percent) were active and interested in the Parent Plus activity.

The extent to which the parents were involved in the Parent Plus activity as well as in the total educational program of their children was indicated by their responses to the Parent Questionnaire. Eighty-one percent of the sixteen respondents indicated they were aware of the activities in which their children participated at school and they themselves had visited both the regular and the Title I classes. Many of the parents (65 percent) assisted their children at home with school work on a daily basis; 35 percent rendered this assistance on a weekly or monthly basis. A large majority (82 percent) felt the activity was effective in that their child had made more progress in school in fiscal 1980 than in the previous year. Most of the parents (88 percent) recommended the activity be continued.

ACTIVITY WEAKNESSES

Many respondents to the teacher and parent surveys rated the Parent Plus activity favorably, but it appeared there were a number of problems associated with the implementation and operation of the activity.

351

There were indications that some of the teachers had a difficult time obtaining sufficient numbers of participants for the program. Information to substantiate this point was contained in the Teacher Questionnaire as well as in a supplemental questionnaire administered to project personnel. In the teacher survey it was revealed that the average caseload for some teachers may have been no larger than 25. Second, it appeared the materials prescribed for home activities, although rated highly by some teachers, were considered by others to be less than ideal for the needs of pupils. Thus one teacher remarked that she wished teachers had freedom to select and order reading kits from vendors of their own choosing. Another teacher pointed out that the weakness of the home-study packages was in the fact that they provided insufficient excersises for the pupils to do. Most of the weekly assignments could be accomplished within an hour.

Although a significant number of parents were reported to be actively involved in the activity, it appeared there were some parents who lacked sufficient interest and motivation for the project. The number of these parents was large enough to cause concerns among some teachers. Finally, it appeared that principals considered the Parent Plus Project to be one of the less effective Title I projects. On a scale of 1 to 3, where 3 was the highest rating, 5 principals assigned the activity an average rating of 1.75 to indicate the effectiveness of the activity in meeting objectives; a rating of 1.75 to indicate the quality of materials used; and a rating of 2.00 to indicate the quality of inservice programs for the teachers. The quality of vendor service or the staff involved in the activity, however, received a higher rating (2.50).

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Among Title I activities designed to involve parents in the educational program of Title I pupils, the Parent Plus Project seemed to be unique in that provision was made for pupils to participate with parents as a team. This feature of the activity had the potential of increasing the likelihood that pupils would receive needed help at home with their school work. In addition, the potential for continued communication between the home and the school was enhanced.

As implemented in fiscal 1980, the activity appeared to have been somewhat effective in getting some parents to participate in educating their children. The extent of this effectiveness, however, was less than what had been hoped for by some teachers and project principals. This low level of success was probably due to the fact that: (1) materials used in the project, particularly the home activities packages, were less than ideal in meeting the educational needs of Title I pupils and (2) teachers were unable in some instances to attract sufficient numbers of parents or to maintain their interest once enrolled in the project.

The major weakness of the Parent Plus activity as designed, however, seems to be that the activity could accommodate only a limited number of Title I parents. Many of the schools selecting this activity seemed to have far more Title I pupils than those who could be involved in the activity.

It follows that the extent to which a Title I school can, through the PPP, marshall parental involvement in the educational program for all its Title I pupils is at best limited. In spite of this weakness, it is suggested that the Parent Plus Project be continued for another year but on condition that the following recommendations be considered: (1) that.allowance be made for schools to choose materials they consider to be effective; (2) that every effort be made to improve the quality of inservice program for the teachers, a change that would probably result in a higher rate of retention of project participants; and (3) that the project be redesigned to allow greater numbers of participants in order for schools to realize a significant impact of parental involvement on the total education program.

R&E #42
Project #233
Program #7640
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

INSTITUTE FOR PARENT INVOLVEMENT

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Institute for Parent Involvement was to provide a sequenced program for cooperative parent-child activities at home designed to supplement regular school work. In its first year as part of the Chicago Title I project in fiscal 1980, the Institute used the talents of local school staff and outside resource persons to enlist and motivate parents to participate. The proposal anticipated that a board-funded teacher would act as a liaison between the Institute, the school, and the community.

IPI's major purpose was to provide parents with materials that specifically helped to remediate their children's reading and mathematics deficiencies at home. Schools selecting this activity serviced 30 to 200 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils, depending on the number of units purchased. Only pupils enrolled in a Title I instructional activity were eligible to participate in IPI.

Program materials consisted of workbooks in reading and mathematics, educational games, library reading lists, and pupil incentives. Bilingual materials were available. There was also a parent resource kit containing workshop materials, ideas for games, and videotape presentations. Placement tests were available to help staff select the appropriate Home Time books for pupils.

The Institute was to conduct four intensive training sessions for school staff and parents citywide as well as follow-up workshop sessions at the local school level during the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Eighteen of the 28 schools participating in IPI in fiscal 1980 selected this activity to involve parents in their children's education, create a more positive attitude toward school, increase knowledge of the school's reading program, and develop a stronger parent-child relationship. Principals felt that the instructional emphasis and methods of IPI best supplemented the needs of their pupils, especially in the area of homework. The relatively low cost and minimum space requirements were also criteria used in IPI's selection.

Initiation of Instruction

This activity was fully implemented by October 15, 1979 in the majority of the schools. It was delayed in five schools due to late delivery of test results and instructional materials.

Staffing

School personnel involved in the management of the program consisted of classroom teachers, IRIP teachers, school-community representatives, adjustment teachers, and, in one situation, a parent supervised by the principal.

Pupil Selection

Most (85 percent) of the IPI pupils participated in another Title I instructional program. According to program managers, the pupils were chosen on the basis of test scores and teacher recommendations. Once pupils were identified, their parents' participation was requested by letter, telephone and home visits. Only one of the program managers reported difficulties in obtaining a sufficient number of participants (parent and/or pupils).

Inservice

IPI staff provided four intensive city-wide inservice meetings during the year; all were well-attended. Vendor service to the individual local school was offered throughout the year to assist school managers with parent workshops, program management, pupil testing, pupil placement and motivational and monitoring suggestions.

In the spring, most principals rated vendor service to the school and vendor-sponsored inservice meetings as generally very effective. Only one principal rated vendor services inadequate.

The initial inservice training sessions dealt with inclusion techniques, expectations regarding behavior, IPI's schedule for consultant services, the flow of activities from pupil selection and parent recruitment to educational prescriptions, circulation of homework materials, and local school logistics.

Since most schools did not have full-time personnel to direct the program, the vendor services offered in this activity were crucial. Ongoing consultant services to organize parent workshops, as indicated in the description, were essential to encourage continued parent enthusiasm throughout the year. Program managers reported conducting up to eighteen group parent workshops, five meetings a year being the average. The average number of parents attending these workshops was ten.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

More than 75 percent of the IPI managers felt the IPI materials were adequate for pupils' needs and interest levels. The remaining respondents were not as satisfied, stating that the materials did not correlate sufficiently with the reading curriculum, were at times boring or inappropriate for all levels, and relied too strongly on parent initiative and educational background. The IPI program provided some monitoring techniques to keep track of completed homework assignments. In the opinion of 70 percent of the program managers this system was helpful in monitoring the parent-pupil partnership for the Home Time assignments. The other managers did not find them helpful because in some instances pupils, not parents, signed the sheets, or the pupils did not do the work assigned. Several managers indicated that they had no accurate way of knowing if the parent helped the child consistently during the year on these home assignments even though they were monitored frequently (on the average of twice a month).

Efficiency of Operation

In its first year as a Title I activity, IPI offered a new concept in parent involvement and in parent-child interaction at home. There were considerable differences in efficiency at the school level. This was dependent on the variety of personnel assigned and the time they had available to manage the program.

Pupil Response

Program managers (90 percent) felt that the IPI program helped their pupils develop more positive attitudes and better self-concepts.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Surveyed IPI parents (96 percent) responded that they helped their children with homework. This exceeded the stated objective of 80 percent. Furthermore, 87 percent of IPI parents said they had visited their children's classroom, also exceeding the 80 percent criterion. Finally, 96 percent said they worked more this year than last year with their children on school-related activities. This exceeded the requirements of the objective.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In comparison to the other Title I parent activities IPI was substantially lower in cost, $6,000 per school plus $15.00 for each selected participant. This program proved to be cost effective for schools with a need to involve parents in their children's education, increase parental awareness of the school's instructional program, and maintain pupil enthusiasm.

Even if a person were budgeted to manage the IPI activity, the services provided would still be cost effective in comparison to other Title I parent activities.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

This program operated in 28 public schools in fiscal 1980, its first year in Chicago's Title I project. The purpose of the program was to involve parents in their children's education at home.

Home assignments did occur, but not consistently throughout the school year. Implementation of the program presented no problems except in a few schools.

Because the program manager was a board-funded teacher in most schools, there was not sufficient time to monitor the program effectively throughout the year to provide the continuous motivation necessary.

Overall, the vendor's citywide inservice meetings and local school services were well received. Only a few administrators expressed dissatisfaction with the services of the vendor and the overall effectiveness of the activity. There was general agreement that the materials provided by the Institute were good. However, the monitoring of the work, the quantity and quality of the incentives, and the consistency of parent involvement warranted improvement.

The pupils in the program reportedly were enthusiastic about completing the Home Book assignments in order to receive an incentive.

The monitoring forms were not always signed by the parents, and the work handed in was not always completely understood because follow-up workshops were not held consistently to review the material.

In most cases, there was agreement that the program was sound in concept, but required improvement in overall management. IPI provided structured guidelines for parents to help their children in a formal ongoing parent program.

The activity met all the relevant 1980 objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The program would function more efficiently if a budgeted program manager were provided.

The materials and program management coordinate better when the SCR is selected as the person involved in its implementation.

The guidelines of the program might include a more active pupil workshop component for review and monitoring of the materials used at home.

It is suggested that the more desirable pupil incentives be offered toward the end, rather than the beginning, of the school year.

The materials sent home could be presented in shorter units, with answer keys provided.

Shorter periods between monitoring sessions would help to pace parent-pupil interest and involvement.

This activity has been assessed as being capable of meeting the needs of the local school. It is recommended for continuation in those schools where a supportive parent service is desired.

R&E #09
Project #562
Program #2099
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

STAFF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH A LOCAL SCHOOL READING RESOURCE SPECIALIST

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Staff Development Through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist (RRS) activity, in its sixth year as an ESEA program, was purchased by 29 public schools in fiscal 1980. Twenty-nine teachers and 29 aides provided supplementary instruction to 435 pupils and local staff. The major purpose of this activity was to provide teachers with continuous training in the teaching of reading.

This project provided each participating school with a full-time teacher of reading and a teacher aide. The reading specialist, a resource person for eight to ten Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils, coordinated Title I activities in the school and provided daily supplementary instruction on a small-group basis to 15 pupils enrolled in other Title I reading activities in the second through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. The RRS provided 15 hours of inservice to each participating teacher. Areas of local school inservice included:

- child development
- learning theories
- grouping for instruction
- reading readiness
- developing word attack skills
- increasing vocabulary skills
- improving skills needed for reading in the content fields
- diagnosing pupil needs
- use of test data
- individualizing the instructional program
- beginning reading instruction
- structural analysis
- improving reading comprehension

In addition, the reading specialist scheduled classroom demonstrations according to the needs of the individual teachers and related to the inservice topics and materials. The reading resource specialist introduced various techniques for teachers to use when planning aides' activities with Title I pupils.

Instructional Dynamics Incorporated provided one initial inservice workshop assisted by central office and district Title I personnel. Additional inservice sessions were provided by the citywide coordinator during the year.

Schools received funds for a professional library and a series of recorded cassette presentations. Local schools selected library books for the purpose of staff development. Inservice training cassettes and player were provided. Each school was provided with $4.50 per pupil for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In the fall of 1979, principals responding to a questionnaire stated the major reasons they selected RRS. More than half said the activity best used the talents of their school's staff. Slightly less than half said the activity's instructional emphasis and methods supplemented the needs of their pupils, as well as supplying needed additional staff to the school. Approximately one-third indicated the activity had been effective in their school in previous years. In addition, the majority stated clearly that this staff development activity would enable one person to coordinate the ESEA materials and activities in their school as well as improve teacher instruction through local inservice. By providing ongoing inservices for eight to ten teachers, some principals felt more pupils in their school would benefit indirectly.

Other reasons stated were the need to improve staff communication and provide techniques for professional growth. One principal indicated the RRS would initiate inservice assistance to Title I teacher aides, who were often unskilled and needed training to work effectively with Title I pupils. Based on comments from teacher aides in this program, this type of training was also desired by administrators and teachers.

Initiation of Instruction

Most principals indicated the program was implemented by mid-October. Twelve sites selecting this activity for fiscal 1980 were continuing schools. Seventeen were new. Two of the new schools late implementation due to late assignments of aides and delayed arrival of instructional materials. In one reported situation, the RRS was unfamiliar with the materials and procedures delaying full implementation until mid-November.

Pupil Selection

Selection of pupils was based on teacher recommendations, reading achievement scores, and continuous progress reading levels. Several principals selected upper level pupils in need of skill reinforcement to reach level for graduation. In addition to pupils being enrolled in another ESEA reading program, priority was given to the lowest achievers who would benefit most. Immaturity and age were additional considerations. In some instances parental requests, other test results (i.e., criterion referenced tests, Stanford Diagnostic tests, readiness tests, and basal reader tests) were used for selection. One principal suggested the guidelines for participation should be changed so that any ESEA eligible pupil could participate in the daily instruction. The program would be more cost effective (serving more pupils) and the instruction more effective allowing the pupil component to be demonstrative and innovative in design.

ILP

Although there was no Individual Learning Plan objective for this activity in fiscal 1980, eleven RRS responding to an ESEA questionnnaire had some form of an individual pupil plan. These teachers indicated they communicated regularly with the classroom teachers, some daily, most weekly, and a few monthly. Some principals felt this communication helped to increase teacher awareness, coordinated instruction, and assisted in focusing on pupil's needs. It should be pointed out that the pupils in this program received reading instruction from two teachers and, in many instances, three---homeroom, RRS, and another ESEA reading program. Because of the potential adverse impact of two or three instructional styles and techniques, plus a wider variety of instructional materials than usual (for low achievers), it was paramount for teachers instructing the same child to communicate regularly.

Staffing

Of eleven teachers responded to a questionnaire, five had been in the program before, two since 1974. The remaining six were newly assigned. Principals were to select a teacher who had demonstrated special competency in teaching of reading to Title I pupils or who had special training in the teaching of reading. The selected teachers must also have possessed the ability to communicate effectively with a school's staff for local inservice meetings, classroom demonstrations and teacher training sessions in reading to produce the maximum staff development effect.

One principal commented, in the fall interview, that because there was a teacher on staff who was highly experienced, innovative, and an expert in developing reading programs, the RRS program was selected. Twenty-two principals responding to the spring Principal Evaluation Form rated their staff development manager as being very effective.

Sixteen aides responded to the spring Teacher Aide Questionnaire. Six had been in the program previously, one of them going back to 1974 and two to 1976. Four aides were assigned late to this program. The remaining aides were assigned by September 1979.

A majority of the aides indicated they spent at least half of their time working directly with the pupils. Several commented that training in the use of audiovisual equipment, dealing with minor discipline situations, conducting group practice and providing reinforcement in reading skills would have helped them perform their duties more effectively. These sample comments reflect the need for paraprofessional training. This staff development activity could be used to provide training to other aides in Title I programs as well.

Inservice

During fiscal 1980 several inservice meetings were scheduled. The initial inservice session in September was conducted by the vendor assisted by the citywide ESEA coordinator. Twenty-two of the twenty-nine RRS managers, responding to the quality of the vendor sponsored meeting, indicated it was better than adequate (23 percent), adequate (59 percent) and inadequate (9 percent). Nine percent made no comment. The remaining inservice meetings, conducted primarily by the ESEA coordinator, were rated as "good" to "very good". Speakers presented services and techniques that could be used for local school staff development and reading skill-building meetings. Teachers shared school inservice techniques as well as instructional materials that were helpful. The majority of teachers felt these inservice sessions helped them to improve their classroom instruction.

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Operating the tutorial component of this activity varied throughout the city. Some RRS teachers met once a day with all 15 pupils. Others met in two or more sessions with smaller groups. Most sessions took place during the morning. Programs observed in the fall were conducted in either regular-sized rooms, a mobile unit, storage rooms, an auditorium stage, a counseling office, a basement storage facility, or space shared with other ESEA programs and school personnel (IRIP, adjustment teacher). Make-shift space is not adequate for reading instruction intended to provide individualization.

The only equipment needed was a cassette player for local inservice programs. The use and service (if needed) of this cassette player was provided by the vendor at the initial inservice meeting. Overall, principals rated the local school inservice, activity materials, equiment and vendor service as average. Three administrators called the activity's inservice tapes worthless, that they were unrealistic, did not promote discussion, and were not stimulating. In many instances the "taped" program did not apply; school staff was better equipped to determine local needs and to plan inservice meetings accordingly.

Teachers also were critical of the inservice tapes: 32 percent rated them "inadequate", 32 percent "adequate", 18 percent "better than adequate", and 18 percent had no comments. The comments received on the spring questionnaires sent to managers had merit, particularly from the continuing RRS teachers. Teachers wanted a greater choice of materials germane to the urban inner-school learning situation. Funds for tapes for continuing schools could be spent better on instructional materials or other staff development sources for materials. The quality (not quantity) of the tapes was mentioned by several RRS managers. Many teachers took time to write comments regarding the tapes. One summed up the feeling of many teachers,

> "The taped programs are expensive and inadequate, especially if you've been in the program over four years. You end up selecting tapes merely to use the $1,000. The money can be better spent on bringing in speakers or for workshops where teachers get input. Then we can turn this information into worthwhile inservice sessions at the school. Little stimulation comes through the tapes."

The teachers also commented on the professional library, although not as critically. Some schools had difficulty receiving professional library shipments, some wanted other sources from which to select library books. One RRS teacher would have liked suggestions to encourage teachers to use the professional library. There were few complaints (other than quantity) regarding the instructional materials used in the reading groups. When teachers were involved in the selection of these instructional materials they were generally able to provide individualized instruction. At the same time they found it relatively easy to correlate these materials with the continuous progress curriculum. A few indicated the need for funds to purchase educational games and reading comprehension masters.

Most of the RRS teachers, responding to the Title I questionnaire, indicated that teacher training sessions at the local schools were "excellent" to "average" in all areas of staff development. Only one-third rated these inservice sessions as "fair" to "poor". Most program managers provided the required 15 hours of local school inservice during the year which helped to improve classroom instruction. The data suggests that one weak area was in providing adequate training to improve the aides' instructional activities with Title I pupils.

Efficiency of Operation

In all sites, pupils were observed doing the assigned tasks: 84 percent were involved in reading; 14 percent in language arts; and two percent in transition. Approximately 42 percent of the pupils were involved in whole group instruction. It would appear that any distractions that might have existed in the space used for the reading program caused no major delays in instructional time or "on task" performance. Workbooks and learning kits were materials most often observed in use.

Teachers were observed most often instructing a whole group. An equal portion of their time was used to instruct smaller groups or individuals and for general pupil supervision. The majority of the aide's time was spent in supervision or tutoring one pupil.

Aides responding to a questionnaire indicated they were actively and directly involved in working with pupils at least 50 percent of the time when classes were in session. The remainder of their time was occupied in record-keeping and preparing instructional materials.

Observations indicated and teachers and aides reported their being called upon to serve as substitutes for regular classroom teachers who were absent. In many cases, the substitute service was provided until a regular substitute arrived. Reading groups had to be cancelled due to inservice meetings, teacher illness, outdoor camping participation, and performing administrative duties. The majority of class cancellations (42 percent) were due to RRS teachers acting as substitute teachers.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The opportunity for parents to visit a RRS tutorial class would not be as convenient as most ESEA programs. In many schools, groups met between one to three periods a day, generally in the morning. However, the majority of parents appeared to cooperate with the RRS, indicating concern and interest in their children's progress. This is reflected by more than half the parents who indicated their children had achieved more in fiscal 1980 as a result of being in the program.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement data must be viewed with the understanding that the pupils in this program are also enrolled in another Title I reading activity. These pupils also receive reading instruction from their homeroom teacher. The impact and effect of these multiple instructional elements (teacher and material) can have both positive as well as negative implications. Participants in the RRS reading program were average for Title I pupils.

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this section can be found in Volume 2.

Table 1 illustrates the standardized test results for the RRS program in fiscal 1980. Achievement results from 21 public schools having 285 matched pre- and posttest scores are contained in Table 1.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=285)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	56%	NO
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	57%	NO
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	YES

Pupils enrolled in the reading component of the RRS program achieved an average grade-equivalent gain of eight months in reading comprehension. The objective of eight months gain in reading comprehension for fiscal 1980 was achieved by a little more than half of the activity participants. The 60 percent criterion for achieving a standard score gain in reading comprehension and vocabulary was not met. The distribution of average grade-equivalent gains in the 21 public schools ranged from 2 months to 10 months in reading comprehension.

Age cycle ten had a positive standard score gain in both reading and vocabulary. The average gain score for upper level pupils (9 months) was higher than that for primary or intermediate level pupils. That upper level pupils showed the greatest achievement gain was consistent with the pattern observed for all Title I pupils.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

There were apprximately 435 pupils participating in the RRS staff development program at a total estimated cost of $1,193,628. The cost was considerably higher than one other staff development program, but only slightly higher than the third such activity which was similar in design.

The aide option in the RRS program, although beneficial, was not essential. Providing services to fifteen pupils each day was not cost effective in relation to the aide's designated daily duties and future budget considerations. The staff development content, as designed, included improving reading, instructional, and teaching skills during the 15 hours of inservice to each participating teacher. Vendor materials did not adequately meet teacher needs. Given the need to improve materials for school workshops, improve reading and vocabulary skills, and meet the guidelines, it would appear that RRS was not particularly cost-effective.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

RRS operated in 29 public schools for its sixth year as a Title I project. This program provided inservice training for eight to ten Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils. In addition, RRS provided daily supplementary reading instruction to 15 pupils enrolled in Title I reading activities.

Implementation posed few difficulties; however, delays were reported in aide assignments and minor delays occurred in materials delivery. Citywide inservice training was provided initially by the vendor and subsequently by the citywide ESEA coordinator. These citywide meetings were more favorably received by RRS teachers than the vendor session. Teacher aides in the program indicated that specific inservice training would have helped them in performing their tasks.

A variety of facilities served as instructional settings for pupils in the reading component: classrooms, a mobile unit, storage rooms, an auditorium, a counseling office, a basement storage room, and shared space.

Critical comments were received from program managers, especially those continuing in the program, concerning the value, quality, and quantity of the cassette tapes. The tapes did not serve the needs of many schools; RRS managers indicating they did not provide techniques for teaching reading skills. One school indicated the professional library was delivered late. Several schools mentioned the infrequent use of the professional library.

R&E #41
Project #609
Program #7641
Evaluator: John Brunetti

NEW EDUCATIONAL DIRECTIONS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Only two schools implemented the New Educational Directions activity (NED) in fiscal 1980, in its sixth year in Chicago's Title I project as a staff development program. This activity provided a teacher-manager and teacher aide to serve 25 or 40 Title I teachers, teachers of Title I pupils, teacher aides, and 20 Title I pupils in a resource laboratory center. Each participating teacher was to use the laboratory for the creation of criterion-referenced instruction materials for 45 minutes weekly. Additional work periods in the laboratory were to be encouraged.

The teacher-manager and aide were to use the management program of the Pacific Learning Services to reinforce and improve the teachers' skills in diagnosing, prescribing, and individualizing instruction in reading and mathematics. Teachers would participate in a series of learning activities based on 15 classroom management objectives, each with criterion-referenced pre- and posttests, reading practice activities, discussion topics, and texts.

The resource center simulated an individualized learning laboratory with appropriate educational furnishings and fixtures. The center was to include the following stations with room dividers for participant instruction:

-Planning station
-Independent study station
-Audiovisual station
-Teacher manager station
-Resource station
-Testing station
-Tutorial station

NED also offered the opportunity for administration and staff to plan long- and short-range goals and to establish better staff relationships.

A five-day management training program was to be conducted by Pacific Learning Services.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In fiscal 1980 only two Title I schools selected this staff development activity. In one school, this activity provided a teacher-manager and resource center for 25 Title I teachers or teachers of Title I pupils and their respective aides; the other school chose to use it for 40 teachers and aides.

Initiation of Instruction

One school's activity was fully implemented in early September, the other by October. Teacher-managers and aides were assigned from the school's staff at the beginning of the school year. The adult component involving teacher training and the pupil classes offering reading instruction to intermediate and upper age cycle pupils had started. Pupil participants received reading instruction daily for one hour. The balance of the teacher day was spent with the adult teacher component in the creation of instructional tools and teaching materials to satisfy the needs of their pupils.

Pupils were selected in September from the Title I eligible list and those who had participated in Title I activities in the current or in the previous year.

Inservice

Out-of-school inservice sessions were held prior to the implementation of the program. The inservice included a three-day workshop on the operation of the center, a one-day conference with the company representatives, and a one-day on site visit of the program. The vendor representatives were consultants and teachers who had long experience in the activity and were thoroughly trained in both the methodology and instructional psychology underlying this kind of teaching. Teacher-managers stated that the most effective component of the total inservice package was the on-site inservice meeting where the vendor consultant met with the teachers being trained, offering instruction and working with them individually. Principals evaluated NED as meeting the schools' objectives but felt the vendor inservices were average.

NED's pupil participants served as a demonstration class for other teachers. Inservices reinforced and improved the teachers' skills in diagnosing, prescribing, and individualizing instruction in reading and mathematics. The laboratory resembled a supermarket of learning experiences.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Observations showed this activity was provided with adequate facilities. In both NED schools, adult and pupil classes met in large, modern, well-lighted, and well-equipped classrooms. Adequate files and other organized storage facilities were on hand to accommodate the large variety of materials that the teachers and children used daily. All of the necessary materials to begin operation of the activity were delivered by the vendor before October.

Principals rated the equipment in the NED labs as average but rated materials as excellent. These ratings were the highest for all Title I staff development activities.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupil achievement gains should not be viewed in the same manner as for a regular Title I reading activity. NED was a staff development activity in which the reading materials developed were used to train teachers. The reading effects cited were not solely the results of this staff develpment activity as these pupils were enrolled in another Title I instructional activity as well.

Based on pretest standard scores, the pupils placed in these demonstration classes were higher achievers than average for Title I. Overall these pupils met all the ITBS achievement objectives: that the pupils achieve an eight month gain in reading comprehension and that 60 percent of the pupils have standard score gains in reading and vocabulary. Pupils in this activity averaged 1.3 grade-equivalent months of gain in reading comprehension. Almost all of them had standard score gains, i.e., 95 percent in reading comprehension and 85 percent in vocabulary. It should be emphasized that these mean gains were based on the matched ITBS scores of only 13 pupils at one of the two participating schools. More information on achievement can be found in Volume 2.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total cost for the NED activity was $109,485 or approximately $1,700 per participating teacher. Supplies were allocated at the rate of six dollars per pupil or $120 per school.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Fiscal 1980 marked the last year for this activity in Chicago's Title I project. While in operation, several learning laboratories were established and became functional under teachers who received training. Achievement results were relatively high. The activity did train teachers in the techniques of the student-centered learning process of Pacific Learning Laboratories.

R&E #49
Project #571
Program #2491
Evaluator: John Brunetti

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Educational Leadership Institute (ELI), a staff development activity, was purchased by 35 schools in fiscal 1980. In its fourth year of operation, ELI provided services to approximately 280 teachers and served 750 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils in small group reading and mathematics experiences. At ten of the 35 schools ELI served only teachers. At schools continuing ELI from the previous year, principals also selected eight to ten parents for participation in five one-day workshops to assist them in the instruction of their children at home.

ELI used the programs and services of the Educational Leadership Institute. The principals, teachers, and parents participated in training activities designed to improve classroom management skills and to improve the school's instructional program in general.

A teacher/coordinator was to be given the responsibility for the planning, implementation, and coordination of the staff development program at each school. A member of the school advisory council was to assist the teacher/coordinator in this process and to maintain communication between the school, parents, and community members. A total of 15 hours of inservice meetings were scheduled. The principal was to provide instructional leadership and support to the staff members participating in ELI. School staff were to receive 10 to 18 days of inservice.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

All principals of Title I schools were interviewed. More than half of the principals who selected the ELI activity said they did so because ELI had been an effective activity in their schools in previous years. Many principals claimed that their teachers needed a staff development program to improve intra-school communication.

Others made it a point to select ELI to improve teachers' classroom management procedures. All the schools which selected the pupil instructional component of the activity wanted a competent, experienced reading teacher to work with a limited number of pupils with serious reading problems.

At some schools principals desired an additional teacher to coordinate Title I activities. Overall, the ELI activity seemed to meet a variety of local school needs.

Staffing

Principals indicated that they selected teachers to lead ELI who were of above average ability. A majority of the ELI teachers had served at their schools for more than five years. However, the average number of years these teachers had spent instructing Title I classes was about two years.

Inservice Training

More than 90 percent of the ELI teachers responding to the Teacher Questionnnaire rated the vendor's inservice sessions and the district level meetings as good or very good. Meetings organized by central office and local school staff were also rated good or very good by the majority of the participating teachers. ELI teachers (94 percent) indicated that the vendor's inservice sessions had improved their skills in properly operating the activity.

Local school staff meetings were considered beneficial by the school staff, which included both Title I and board-funded teachers.

A majority of the principals responding felt that the ELI inservice sessions were above average. They gave as their reason the emphasis on improving teachers' attitudes and on increased communication among staff, parents, and pupils.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Approximately 90 percent of the ELI classrooms observed were conducted in rooms which were not shared with another class. However, about 30 percent of the observed classes were being conducted in rooms which were not regular classrooms. ELI teachers did not complain about these conditions. Half of the classroom facilities observed were rated average as far as their physical environment was concerned. Several were rated below average.

Thirty-three percent were rated above average because pupils' current work was displayed, bulletin board materials were relevant and timely, and the rooms were well organized. A majority of the schools maintaing ELI activities were rated above average because of the efficient management of the school sites.

When asked to rate the ELI materials and equipment, principals judged them to be above average. In concord with the principals' ratings, a majority (88 percent) of the ELI teachers reported that instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for all pupil achievement levels. Most rated the quality of the materials as good or excellent. However, only a little more than 70 percent said they received Title I consumable supplies in sufficient quantity.

ELI teachers were able to individualize instruction with the available materials. Many also indicated that they had been involved in the selection of pupils' instructional materials. Most thought that the correlation of the ELI instrtuctional materials with the Chicago CP/ML continuum was quite good.

In the observed classrooms more than half of the pupils were working with various kinds of instructional materials or manipulatives. The remaining pupils were engaged in listening or watching activities.

Efficiency of Operation

In the pupil instruction component of ELI, [illegible] percent of the teachers observed were rated to be above average in giving clear assignments and directions, in adapting lessons to pupils' levels, and in creating a personal atmosphere which allowed some pupils to work efficiently. Many (66 percent) of these teachers were observed giving individualized instruction. However, the overall teacher effect on classroom management was rated only average for half of the observed classes. In approximately 20 percent of the classes this teacher effect received a below average rating. This may reflect the fact that 24 percent of the ELI teachers were undecided or not willing to teach in the activity again the following year.

During the first semester, observations of ELI classrooms revealed that approximately 84 percent of the pupils were working on their assigned tasks and that six percent were waiting for an assignment. The observations conducted in the second semester showed that all pupils were working at their assigned tasks.

Pupil Responses

ELI teachers rated a mjaority of their pupils (88 percent) as actively and cooperatively involved in the classroom activities. Only six percent of the pupils were interested but not actively involved, and the remaining six percent were judged completely uninterested.

Staff Communication

Ninety percent of the ELI teachers who responded to a questionnaire indicated that they communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' achievement and progress. Usually, the ELI teachers (47 percent) met with the board-funded teacher of the pupils weekly. A third met daily. The remainder indicated fewer meetings: once a month or less frequently. All these meetings were reported to be informal.

Maintaining pupils' ILPs was, at most schools, shared by the ELI and board-funded teachers. A few ELI teachers reported they were solely responsible for this task.

Communication between the home and the school was maintained through the ELI parent inservices and through the services of the School-Community Representatives (SCRs) at those schools having them. More than half of the ELI teachers said the SCRs made them more aware of their pupils' home environments and their instructional needs. On the other hand, 23 percent were not sure if the SCRs were useful and 15 percent were unaware of the SCRs' services.

PARENT INVOVLEMENT

ELI teachers indicated that 41 percent of the parents were actively and cooperatively involved in the activity, 47 percent were interested but not active, and 15 percent were uninterested. These results were about average for Title I activities.

Almost all (93 percent) of the parents responding to a parent questionnaire were aware that their children participated in a Title I activity. This exceeded the evaluation objective of 90 percent.

Ninety percent of the parents said that they had visited their children's regular classrooms. Approximately 70 percent reported that they had visited the ELI classroom. This exceeded the evaluation objective of 60 percent.

Additional data on parent involvement revealed that 93 percent of the parents had assisted their children more than they had in the previous school year. About 80 percent of the parents thought that their children achieved more academically because they participated in ELI. Finally, all the parents agreed that the activity should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupils chosen to participate in ELI were to be those judged, by the principal and teachers, as being most in need of additional assistance. In fact, the average pupil in ELI had a higher standard score on the ITBS than the average for all Title I pupils suggesting that in the majority of cases the participating pupils were not the most in need. This was especially true of primary level pupils.

As may be seen in Table 1, only the eight month achievement objectives were met. An examination of the tables in Volume 2 reveals great inconsistency between age cycles. Age cycle eight pupils achieved an average gain of only three grade-equivalent months while age cycle thirteen gained 1.2 grade-equivalent years. Differences between school averages were also large, ranging from one month to 2.2 years in grade-equivalent gain and from 33 to 92 percent of the pupils achieving standard score gains. One school which had selected ELI for 30 pupils had pre- and posttest scores for 124 pupils, suggesting that individual pupils were not served for an entire year but that pupils were rotated through the ELI activity.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=731)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52%	no
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	57%	no
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	yes
Mathematics Total:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	55%	no
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	yes

Some schools served pupils in kindergarten and the first year beyond kindewrgarten who were tested with the CTBS. Both groups had mean scores in the low-average range nationally. The relevant evaluation objective required 45 percent of the age cycle five and 40 percent of the age cycle six pupils to obtain reading scores above the national average. Only 13 percent of the five-year-olds and 24 percent of the six-year-olds met this objective. These data suggest that ELI inadequately met the needs of kindergarten and young primary level pupils.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Because some schools used the pupil instruction option and some not, cost effectiveness was difficult to assess for ELI. The estimated total cost of $1,128,792 was high for a staff development activity.

The cost per unit for the options offering direct pupil instruction was approximately three times the amount for the options providing the staff development services only. Clearly, without the pupil option, ELI's total cost would be considerably reduced. The best estimate of the per pupil cost for ELI places it among the most expensive of all Title I activities. Since the academic achievement of the participating pupils as measured by standardized tests was not outstanding, it seems probable that ELI was not particularly cost effective.

No good measure of the productivity of staff development activities which did not use direct pupil instruction was available. Consequently, the cost effectivenss of these options could not be determined.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

ELI obviously served a need since principals were eager to select it and praised the vendor's services. However, it is not clear from this evaluation what need was served. The pupils selected to participate in general did not appear to be those most in need of remediation. Nor were pupils' achievement gains better than those observed in many other Title I activities.

Very little is known of the uses to which ELI was put in those schools not implementing the instructional option other than that the participating teachers seemed mildly positive. It appears, from observations and staff comments, that at some schools ELI was used mainly to support a person to coordinate Title I activities and teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ELI option in which the teacher/manager also instructs 30 pupils should be limited to upper cycle pupils.

In the pupil option, ELI teacher/managers should accept greater responsibility for the progress of the pupils assigned to them.

ELI, as implemented in fiscal 1980, was only occasionally capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population at particular schools. If a more effective activity is available, ELI should be replaced.

R&E #48
Project #613
Program #3480
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

HEALTH SERVICES

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Health Services activity was designed as a supportive project for selected public and non-public school children who were in preschool through the eighth year of school beyond kindergarten and who participated in a Title I instructional project.

The project operated in coordination with and supplemented the services of the board-funded health program by providing medical examinations and evaluation, dental and visual screening, referral and follow-up of medical and dental problems, and parental consultations and conferences with school staff concerning findings and procedures for follow-up services. Educational materials were also available for distribution to pupils.

The purpose of the Health Services activity was to help school staff and parents identify any major health problems which might affect pupils' academic achievement. Pupils requiring treatment were to be referred to the appropriate medical and dental personnel. The specific objectives to be met by this activity were specified as follows: (a) the need to involve parents in the school program, (b) the need to encourage pupils to seek medical advice, and (c) the need to encourage pupils to seek treatment for health problems.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

In the 1979-80 school year, 36 public and 27 private schools purchased the activity. A health team consisting of 1.5 physicians, 1 medical lab technician, 3 health aides, 3 public health nurses, 3 school nurses, and 1 principal clerk visited sites scattered across the city.

An analysis of records provided by the Bureau of Medical and School Health Services indicated that 4,211 pupils were referred to the medical team for health examinations. Eighty-nine percent were found to have a number of health problems. A total of 9,191 problems, an average of two to three per pupil, were detected. The most common problems were impaired vision, found in 14 percent of all cases;

nutritional deficiences, 10 percent; ear and hearing defects, 10 percent; skin problems, 9 percent; and heart murmurs, 7 percent. Table 1 presents a complete breakdown.

TABLE 1. TYPES OF HEALTH PROBLEMS FOUND (N=9191)

Asthma	201	2.2
Hayfever	17	0.2
Birth Defects	134	1.5
Anemia (under 11 gr. Hb)	30	0.3
High Blood Pressure	18	0.2
Heart Murmurs, Functional	476	5.2
Heart Murmurs, Organic	24	0.3
Bones (joints, muscles)	179	2.0
Dental	1187	12.9
Ear and Hearing	895	9.7
Eye and Vision	1311	14.3
Diabetes and Endocrine	13	0.1
Gastrointestinal	32	0.3
Genito-urinary	116	1.3
Hernias	386	4.2
Learning Disabilities	8	0.1
Bronchitis	7	0.1
Epilepsy	25	0.3
Nutritional	933	10.2
Skin	830	9.0
Speech	183	2.0
Sickel Cell: Positive	266	2.9
Urinalysis: Abnormal	251	2.7
Other	1669	18.2

A significant number of the pupils were given immunizations for polio, measles, rubella, and other diseases. The number of pupils who were treated for health defects identified through the medical examinations remains unknown although 2,263 were referred for further treatment.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The extent to which parents through the Health Services activity were involved in the school program may be inferred from responses to the Parent Questionnaire. This instrument was sent to a random sample of parents of all Title I pupils. Eight parents responded to items dealing with the Health Services activity. Six of the eight respondents indicated that they were aware of the participation by their child in the Health Services activity; they themselves had visited the school to see the activity in operation. Seven of the parents responded favorably to the question of whether Health Services should be continued in the future. Based on a limited number of responses, it appears the 90 percent objective for parental awareness of the activity was probably not attained.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Probably the major strength of the Health Services activity lies in the provision of a medical team for the purpose of on-site diagnosis of health defects which could possibly be a factor associated with slow academic progress among Title I pupils. The high rate of Title I pupils with health defects (89 percent) justified operation of the activity. Additional beneficial effects of Health Services are believed to be improved attitudes towards school on the part of pupils, providing pupils with a supplemental health education program, and developing pupils' awareness that school officials are concerned with their physical well-being. These conclusions are based on comments made by activity personnel in response to a staff questionnaire at the end of the school year.

A disturbing aspect of the Health Services project lies in the lack of knowledge of the extent to which children diagnosed to have health defects actually received the required treatment. Health records maintained by the Medical Team seem to yield very little information with respect to the proportion of pupils receiving treatment after referral.

Health Services activity identified physical defects among 89 percent of the pupils examined. Thus an important objective of the project, to identify and refer health problems for treatment, may have been achieved. The team also provided supplemental health education to participants and those parents who accompanied their children.

The weakness of the activity has been the apparent failure to maintain a vigorous follow-up program to insure that pupils referred for treatment receive the required treatment. If the paramount objective of the project is to improve the learning capacity of youngsters limited by some health problem, it behooves those concerned to see that pupils do receive the necessary medical attention.

It is recommended that the Health Services activity be continued as a component of the educational program of Title I pupils.

R&E #32
Project #598
Program #8320
Evaluator: Joseph Schroeder

SCHOOL COMMUNITY IDENTIFICATION

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In fiscal 1980, 195 public and 34 private schools conducted the School Community Identification (SCI) activity. This was SCI's 14th year in the Chicago Title I project. Approximately 25,000 pupils participated in the activity.

School Community Representatives (SCRs) were paraprofessionals working under the direct supervision of the principal. Their function was to foster closer relationships between teachers and parents of Title I pupils. A full-time SCR was to provide support services to 70 pupils who were participants in a Title I activity. A half-time SCR was to provide services for 35 eligible pupils. Schools purchasing this activity also had the option of purchasing a dissemination component which provided funds for the printing of brochures and pamphlets which school staff and the school advisory council felt would inform the parents.

SCRs were expected to visit homes of the participating pupils every two months to establish and foster a closer relationship between home and school. Other tasks included contact by telephone, classroom visitations, referring parents to appropriate social agencies, and sponsoring workshops to show parents how they could help their children develop positive attitudes toward learning. The SCR was expected to maintain a daily log of activities on the standard log form and to submit monthly reports on activities to the principal and district superintendent. SCRs were to receive inservice one half-day each month from district coordinators.

Generally, staff--especially principals--indicated a favorable attitude toward this activity. Title I schools have repeatedly purchased this activity and observation of some of the inservices during fiscal 1980 showed that district coordinators were monitoring SCRs and providing expertise in areas of management, human relations, and problem solving.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Implementation

During on-site visitations by field evaluators, it was noted that Title I schools did have the SCI activity in operation. Depending on the Title I pupil population, one half-time to four full-time SCRs were on duty. Informal observation at schools indicated that the SCR did maintain a list of Title I participants and a log book of activities.

Staffing

Two hundred thirty six SCR's in 150 public schools responded to the 1980 Title I SCR Questionnaire. Generally, SCRs were experienced, the majority reporting having 10 years experience in the activity.

SCRs reported having a variety of tasks. These included contacting parents on pupil attendance or school behavior, assisting teachers with pupils, acting as liaison between the school and home, informing parents of Title I activities, dealing with pupil health problems, and referring parents in need of assistance to various agencies.

Inservice

Based on the schedules submitted to district coordinators and on observations of two SCR inservice meetings, it was evident that monthly inservice meetings took place to provide activity staff with support.

SCRs rated inservice meetings and listed the approximate number and type they attended through the year. Meetings were rated on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being poor and 4 being excellent. The average rating was over three which approaches excellent. The staff conducting the majority of meetings were district coordinators and local school staff such as SCRs, teachers, and principals. In addition, central office administrators and district administrators conducted inservice meetings. All staff conducting the inservices were rated highly by SCRs.

Facilities and Operation

Ninety percent of the SCR's reported that they had adequate working space. During on-site observation of Title I classrooms it was evident that most SCRs either shared a regular size classroom with one or two other non-instructional staff or had a smaller room to conduct daily activities. The 10 percent reporting they did not have adequate working space were those who shared desk space in the main office of a school. Some SCRs indicated that they needed more privacy.

During informal visits to the SCRs' offices supplemented by district coordinators' and central office administrators' records, it was determined that SCRs kept a log of daily activities. Full-time SCRs had 70 pupils assigned to them for follow-up and also kept records of meetings with parents. All of the SCRs worked under the supervision of the principal.

The great majority of SCR respondents (97 percent) indicated that the principal had confidence in them and 87 percent thought they had enough responsibilities. As for working with teachers, 94 percent of the SCRs felt "comfortable." Time spent working directly with pupils varied: 39 percent of the SCRs reported they spent from 25 to 50 percent of their time in work directly related to pupils; 32 percent indicated that they spent more than 50 percent of their time working with pupils; and less than 25 percent of working time spent with pupils was reported by 29 percent of the SCRs.

ACTIVITY EFFECTIVENESS

Two evaluation objectives applied to SCI in fiscal 1980:

> At least 75 percent of the Title I teachers at schools participating in this activity will indicate increased awareness of the home situation and the instructional needs of their pupils as a result of this activity.
>
> At least 80 percent of the participating parents will better understand their children's needs and be more able to assist them in their education at home as a result of this activity.

Over 800 Title I teachers responded to an item on the Title I Teacher Questionnaire that assisted in measuring the first objective. Table I shows the frequency and type of responses to whether or not the teachers felt they were more aware of their pupils home situation and instructional needs because of the SCI activity.

TABLE 1. TEACHERS' OPINIONS OF SCI

Question	Percent	Number
Teachers Had Greater Awareness Of Pupils' Home Situations:		
-Yes	64	531
-Not Sure	19	160
-No	17	146
Teachers Had Greater Awareness of Pupils' Instructional Needs:		
-Yes	57	472
-Not Sure	22	178
-No	21	176

Based on teacher opinion, it was obvious that SCI did not meet the objective related to teachers. It is interesting to note, however, that principals responding to the Principal Evaluation Form provided more favorable results. Table 2 shows the ratings by principals of SCI for "meeting objectives" and "staff."

TABLE 2. RATING OF SCRS BY PRINCIPALS

Rating	Meeting Objectives		Staff	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Very Efficient	103	76	106	81
Average	29	21	23	18
Inefficient	4	3	2	2

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Over 1,000 parents of Title I pupils responded to the Title I Parent Questionnaire. Of these parents only 22 indicated that they were aware of the SCI activity. The majority of the few parents responding on SCI indicated that they were in favor of seeing the activity continued and that their children were achieving more because of the SCI activity.

SCRs reported on the SCR Questionnaire that they helped parents whenever possible by conducting parent meetings, providing sewing and craft classes, assisting in referring parents in need to various social agencies, and sponsoring clothing collections for pupils in need of clothing.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The total cost of SCI during fiscal 1980 was $4,797,560. The number of pupils served was approximately 25,000. The per pupil cost to conduct this activity during fiscal 1980 was $191. Based on the high ratings of principals who supervised SCRs and SCR tasks related to improving communication between the school and parents, the cost of the activity may be considered reasonable.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

Evaluation findings indicated that the SCRs were generally experienced staff conducting a variety of socially oriented activities in Title I Schools.

There is evidence that principals thought the service provided by SCI staff was effective and valuable. The majority of SCRs reported that they felt their principals had confidence in them in relation to their tasks.

The majority of the SCRs attended monthly inservice meetings designed to assist them in carrying out their duties. Although the majority of teachers reported favorably on SCRs assisting them with pupils in need, a lower percentage of teachers reported favorably on SCI than did principals.

Data from parents was positive though too limited to ascertain whether the SCRs were performing a valuable service in relation to parents needs. The majority of principals claimed that the SCRs were indeed actively involved with parents of Title I pupils.

Considering the number of years principals have selected the activity and the nature of the SCRs' duties, one can assume the activity had merit. There is evidence, however, that the activity could be strengthened in certain areas to be more effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The School Community Identification program should be continued with the following modifications:

- District coordinators or others concerned with providing inservice to SCRs should emphasize tasks that enhance the relationship between the SCR and teacher.

- Programs should be developed within the SCI activity that allow more parents to become aware and involved.

- Highly rated, experienced SCRs should be given an opportunity to share their techniques and procedures with other SCRs, across districts if necessary.

- Schedules of time allotments for particular SCR tasks should be as comprehensive as daily schedules are for teachers.

R&E #62
Project #612
Program #7698
Evaluator: Morven Ngaiyaye

PARENT PLUS PROJECT

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

During fiscal 1980, its second year of operation in Title I, ten public schools purchased the Parent Plus Project (PPP) for 540 parents and an equivalent number of pupils. A total of nine full-time equivalent teachers and ten teacher aides were assigned to implement the activity in the various schools.

The Parent Plus Activity was designed to provide cooperative learning sessions at home for parents and their children. Pupils received four 10-week activity packets to be done at home; the parents were expected to spend one hour each week helping their children with the learning activities which were based on the basal reading and mathematics textbooks currently in use at their school.

In addition to the weekly home sessions, the parents were to meet at school in small groups for an equivalent of four full days each month with a teacher. The intent of the meetings was to study and discuss various aspects of child development and engage in homemaking, health and nutrition, modern mathematics, consumer education, crafts and sewing activities. The teacher was expected also to work with the parents on topics related to the academic needs of their children in such areas as word-attack skills, basic mathematics techniques, language expression, comprehension, phonetic analysis, and related skills necessary for parents to work more effectively with the children.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENMT

Initiation of Instruction

From all indications, it appears that the schools were able to implement the Parent Plus activity without significant delays. Teachers who responded to the Teacher Questionnaire indicated that they had managed to select participants for their classes and begun scheduling school activities for the parents by the beginning of the fourth week of school, September 24th. By that date, the necessary instructional materials and other supplies had been received. Many of these materials and supplies were rated good or excellent by the surveyed teachers. The materials were also considered to be adequate for the needs of the teachers.

Inservice

In order to ensure the effectiveness of the Parent Plus Project, a number of inservice training workshops were held for the teachers. These inservice meetings were presented by the activity vendor. Some were also presented by district and central office personnel. In isolated instances, inservice meetings were arranged by the local school staff. Teachers who attended the inservice meetings considered them to have been good or very good. This conclusion is limited, however, in that only a third of the activity teachers returned the Teacher Questionnaire.

Instruction

During visits to activity classes, it was observed that teachers worked with parents in a variety of activities. Although these activities included reading excercises to be done at home with their children, many times teachers engaged the parents in other activities presumably intended to improve the quality of home life of Title I pupils. Activities falling in this category included better ways of preparing meals and effective techniques for mending and making clothes. From time to time field trips were arranged to acquaint parents with the cultural and educational enrichment centers of the city.

Staff Roles

While the role of the teacher encompassed all aspects of the implementation and management of PPP, the role of the teacher aide appeared to be supportive and supplemental in nature. The teacher aide's role was to assist the teacher with the evaluation of pupils' at-home work, preparation of classroom displays, and preparation of materials needed for parents in school activities.

Program Cost

An analysis of budget records indicates that in fiscal 1980, the Parent Plus Project per pupil cost was $691 with a total cost of $373,009.

ACTIVITY EFFECTIVENESS

Parent Involvement

The major strength of this activity appears to be its potential for involving parents in the education of their children. Although other forms of parent involvement activities may focus on the same objective, the Parent Plus Project appears to be unique in that provision was made for pupils and parents to participate as a team. This arrangement seems to have two main advantages: (1) it increases the likelihood that pupils will receive help at home in their effort to learn, and (2) it fosters continuing communication between the home and the school.

The extent to which the advantages of the Parent Plus Project was indicated by questionnaires returned by parents and school staff. Teachers who returned the Teacher Questionnaire noted the activity to be either moderately or very effective. In response to a supplemental questionnaire, six out of seven teachers felt the Parent Plus Project: (a) improved attitudes towards school on the part of pupils, (b) helped parents to better understand their children's educational needs, and (c) generated interest in learning. The teachers also believed that the majority of parents (88 percent) and of pupils (85 percent) were active and interested in the Parent Plus activity.

The extent to which the parents were involved in the Parent Plus activity as well as in the total educational program of their children was indicated by their responses to the Parent Questionnaire. Eighty-one percent of the sixteen respondents indicated they were aware of the activities in which their children participated at school and they themselves had visited both the regular and the Title I classes. Many of the parents (65 percent) assisted their children at home with school work on a daily basis; 35 percent rendered this assistance on a weekly or monthly basis. A large majority (82 percent) felt the activity was effective in that their child had made more progress in school in fiscal 1980 than in the previous year. Most of the parents (88 percent) recommended the activity be continued.

ACTIVITY WEAKNESSES

Many respondents to the teacher and parent surveys rated the Parent Plus activity favorably, but it appeared there were a number of problems associated with the implementation and operation of the activity.

There were indications that some of the teachers had a difficult time obtaining sufficient numbers of participants for the program. Information to substantiate this point was contained in the Teacher Questionnaire as well as in a supplemental questionnaire administered to project personnel. In the teacher survey it was revealed that the average caseload for some teachers may have been no larger than 25. Second, it appeared the materials prescribed for home activities, although rated highly by some teachers, were considered by others to be less than ideal for the needs of pupils. Thus one teacher remarked that she wished teachers had freedom to select and order reading kits from vendors of their own choosing. Another teacher pointed out that the weakness of the home-study packages was in the fact that they provided insufficient excersises for the pupils to do. Most of the weekly assignments could be accomplished within an hour.

Although a significant number of parents were reported to be actively involved in the activity, it appeared there were some parents who lacked sufficient interest and motivation for the project. The number of these parents was large enough to cause concerns among some teachers. Finally, it appeared that principals considered the Parent Plus Project to be one of the less effective Title I projects. On a scale of 1 to 3, where 3 was the highest rating, 5 principals assigned the activity an average rating of 1.75 to indicate the effectiveness of the activity in meeting objectives; a rating of 1.75 to indicate the quality of materials used; and a rating of 2.00 to indicate the quality of inservice programs for the teachers. The quality of vendor service or the staff involved in the activity, however, received a higher rating (2.50).

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Among Title I activities designed to involve parents in the educational program of Title I pupils, the Parent Plus Project seemed to be unique in that provision was made for pupils to participate with parents as a team. This feature of the activity had the potential of increasing the likelihood that pupils would receive needed help at home with their school work. In addition, the potential for continued communication between the home and the school was enhanced.

As implemented in fiscal 1980, the activity appeared to have been somewhat effective in getting some parents to participate in educating their children. The extent of this effectiveness, however, was less than what had been hoped for by some teachers and project principals. This low level of success was probably due to the fact that: (1) materials used in the project, particularly the home activities packages, were less than ideal in meeting the educational needs of Title I pupils and (2) teachers were unable in some instances to attract sufficient numbers of parents or to maintain their interest once enrolled in the project.

The major weakness of the Parent Plus activity as designed, however, seems to be that the activity could accommodate only a limited number of Title I parents. Many of the schools selecting this activity seemed to have far more Title I pupils than those who could be involved in the activity.

It follows that the extent to which a Title I school can, through the PPP, marshall parental involvement in the educational program for all its Title I pupils is at best limited. In spite of this weakness, it is suggested that the Parent Plus Project be continued for another year but on condition that the following recommendations be considered: (1) that.allowance be made for schools to choose materials they consider to be effective; (2) that every effort be made to improve the quality of inservice program for the teachers, a change that would probably result in a higher rate of retention of project participants; and (3) that the project be redesigned to allow greater numbers of participants in order for schools to realize a significant impact of parental involvement on the total education program.

R&E #42
Project #233
Program #7640
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

INSTITUTE FOR PARENT INVOLVEMENT

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Institute for Parent Involvement was to provide a sequenced program for cooperative parent-child activities at home designed to supplement regular school work. In its first year as part of the Chicago Title I project in fiscal 1980, the Institute used the talents of local school staff and outside resource persons to enlist and motivate parents to participate. The proposal anticipated that a board-funded teacher would act as a liaison between the Institute, the school, and the community.

IPI's major purpose was to provide parents with materials that specifically helped to remediate their children's reading and mathematics deficiencies at home. Schools selecting this activity serviced 30 to 200 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils, depending on the number of units purchased. Only pupils enrolled in a Title I instructional activity were eligible to participate in IPI.

Program materials consisted of workbooks in reading and mathematics, educational games, library reading lists, and pupil incentives. Bilingual materials were available. There was also a parent resource kit containing workshop materials, ideas for games, and videotape presentations. Placement tests were available to help staff select the appropriate Home Time books for pupils.

The Institute was to conduct four intensive training sessions for school staff and parents citywide as well as follow-up workshop sessions at the local school level during the year.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

Eighteen of the 28 schools participating in IPI in fiscal 1980 selected this activity to involve parents in their children's education, create a more positive attitude toward school, increase knowledge of the school's reading program, and develop a stronger parent-child relationship. Principals felt that the instructional emphasis and methods of IPI best supplemented the needs of their pupils, especially in the area of homework. The relatively low cost and minimum space requirements were also criteria used in IPI's selection.

Initiation of Instruction

This activity was fully implemented by October 15, 1979 in the majority of the schools. It was delayed in five schools due to late delivery of test results and instructional materials.

Staffing

School personnel involved in the management of the program consisted of classroom teachers, IRIP teachers, school-community representatives, adjustment teachers, and, in one situation, a parent supervised by the principal.

Pupil Selection

Most (85 percent) of the IPI pupils participated in another Title I instructional program. According to program managers, the pupils were chosen on the basis of test scores and teacher recommendations. Once pupils were identified, their parents' participation was requested by letter, telephone and home visits. Only one of the program managers reported difficulties in obtaining a sufficient number of participants (parent and/or pupils).

Inservice

IPI staff provided four intensive city-wide inservice meetings during the year; all were well-attended. Vendor service to the individual local school was offered throughout the year to assist school managers with parent workshops, program management, pupil testing, pupil placement and motivational and monitoring suggestions.

In the spring, most principals rated vendor service to the school and vendor-sponsored inservice meetings as generally very effective. Only one principal rated vendor services inadequate.

The initial inservice training sessions dealt with inclusion techniques, expectations regarding behavior, IPI's schedule for consultant services, the flow of activities from pupil selection and parent recruitment to educational prescriptions, circulation of homework materials, and local school logistics.

Since most schools did not have full-time personnel to direct the program, the vendor services offered in this activity were crucial. Ongoing consultant services to organize parent workshops, as indicated in the description, were essential to encourage continued parent enthusiasm throughout the year. Program managers reported conducting up to eighteen group parent workshops, five meetings a year being the average. The average number of parents attending these workshops was ten.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

More than 75 percent of the IPI managers felt the IPI materials were adequate for pupils' needs and interest levels. The remaining respondents were not as satisfied, stating that the materials did not correlate sufficiently with the reading curriculum, were at times boring or inappropriate for all levels, and relied too strongly on parent initiative and educational background. The IPI program provided some monitoring techniques to keep track of completed homework assignments. In the opinion of 70 percent of the program managers this system was helpful in monitoring the parent-pupil partnership for the Home Time assignments. The other managers did not find them helpful because in some instances pupils, not parents, signed the sheets, or the pupils did not do the work assigned. Several managers indicated that they had no accurate way of knowing if the parent helped the child consistently during the year on these home assignments even though they were monitored frequently (on the average of twice a month).

Efficiency of Operation

In its first year as a Title I activity, IPI offered a new concept in parent involvement and in parent-child interaction at home. There were considerable differences in efficiency at the school level. This was dependent on the variety of personnel assigned and the time they had available to manage the program.

Pupil Response

Program managers (90 percent) felt that the IPI program helped their pupils develop more positive attitudes and better self-concepts.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Surveyed IPI parents (96 percent) responded that they helped their children with homework. This exceeded the stated objective of 80 percent. Furthermore, 87 percent of IPI parents said they had visited their children's classroom, also exceeding the 80 percent criterion. Finally, 96 percent said they worked more this year than last year with their children on school-related activities. This exceeded the requirements of the objective.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

In comparison to the other Title I parent activities IPI was substantially lower in cost, $6,000 per school plus $15.00 for each selected participant. This program proved to be cost effective for schools with a need to involve parents in their children's education, increase parental awareness of the school's instructional program, and maintain pupil enthusiasm.

Even if a person were budgeted to manage the IPI activity, the services provided would still be cost effective in comparison to other Title I parent activities.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSION

This program operated in 28 public schools in fiscal 1980, its first year in Chicago's Title I project. The purpose of the program was to involve parents in their children's education at home.

Home assignments did occur, but not consistently throughout the school year. Implementation of the program presented no problems except in a few schools.

Because the program manager was a board-funded teacher in most schools, there was not sufficient time to monitor the program effectively throughout the year to provide the continuous motivation necessary.

Overall, the vendor's citywide inservice meetings and local school services were well received. Only a few administrators expressed dissatisfaction with the services of the vendor and the overall effectiveness of the activity. There was general agreement that the materials provided by the Institute were good. However, the monitoring of the work, the quantity and quality of the incentives, and the consistency of parent involvement warranted improvement.

The pupils in the program reportedly were enthusiastic about completing the Home Book assignments in order to receive an incentive.

The monitoring forms were not always signed by the parents, and the work handed in was not always completely understood because follow-up workshops were not held consistently to review the material.

In most cases, there was agreement that the program was sound in concept, but required improvement in overall management. IPI provided structured guidelines for parents to help their children in a formal ongoing parent program.

The activity met all the relevant 1980 objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The program would function more efficiently if a budgeted program manager were provided.

The materials and program management coordinate better when the SCR is selected as the person involved in its implementation.

The guidelines of the program might include a more active pupil workshop component for review and monitoring of the materials used at home.

It is suggested that the more desirable pupil incentives be offered toward the end, rather than the beginning, of the school year.

The materials sent home could be presented in shorter units, with answer keys provided.

Shorter periods between monitoring sessions would help to pace parent-pupil interest and involvement.

This activity has been assessed as being capable of meeting the needs of the local school. It is recommended for continuation in those schools where a supportive parent service is desired.

R&E #09
Project #562
Program #2099
Evaluator: Elissa Bakall

STAFF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH A LOCAL SCHOOL READING RESOURCE SPECIALIST

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

The Staff Development Through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist (RRS) activity, in its sixth year as an ESEA program, was purchased by 29 public schools in fiscal 1980. Twenty-nine teachers and 29 aides provided supplementary instruction to 435 pupils and local staff. The major purpose of this activity was to provide teachers with continuous training in the teaching of reading.

This project provided each participating school with a full-time teacher of reading and a teacher aide. The reading specialist, a resource person for eight to ten Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils, coordinated Title I activities in the school and provided daily supplementary instruction on a small-group basis to 15 pupils enrolled in other Title I reading activities in the second through the eighth years of school beyond kindergarten. The RRS provided 15 hours of inservice to each participating teacher. Areas of local school inservice included:

-child development
-learning theories
-grouping for instruction
-reading readiness
-developing word attack skills
-increasing vocabulary skills
-improving skills needed for reading in the content fields
-diagnosing pupil needs
-use of test data
-individualizing the instructional program
-beginning reading instruction
-structural analysis
-improving reading comprehension

In addition, the reading specialist scheduled classroom demonstrations according to the needs of the individual teachers and related to the inservice topics and materials. The reading resource specialist introduced various techniques for teachers to use when planning aides' activities with Title I pupils.

Instructional Dynamics Incorporated provided one initial inservice workshop assisted by central office and district Title I personnel. Additional inservice sessions were provided by the citywide coordinator during the year.

Schools received funds for a professional library and a series of recorded cassette presentations. Local schools selected library books for the purpose of staff development. Inservice training cassettes and player were provided. Each school was provided with $4.50 per pupil for supplies.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In the fall of 1979, principals responding to a questionnaire stated the major reasons they selected RRS. More than half said the activity best used the talents of their school's staff. Slightly less than half said the activity's instructional emphasis and methods supplemented the needs of their pupils, as well as supplying needed additional staff to the school. Approximately one-third indicated the activity had been effective in their school in previous years. In addition, the majority stated clearly that this staff development activity would enable one person to coordinate the ESEA materials and activities in their school as well as improve teacher instruction through local inservice. By providing ongoing inservices for eight to ten teachers, some principals felt more pupils in their school would benefit indirectly.

Other reasons stated were the need to improve staff communication and provide techniques for professional growth. One principal indicated the RRS would initiate inservice assistance to Title I teacher aides, who were often unskilled and needed training to work effectively with Title I pupils. Based on comments from teacher aides in this program, this type of training was also desired by administrators and teachers.

Initiation of Instruction

Most principals indicated the program was implemented by mid-October. Twelve sites selecting this activity for fiscal 1980 were continuing schools. Seventeen were new. Two of the new schools late implementation due to late assignments of aides and delayed arrival of instructional materials. In one reported situation, the RRS was unfamiliar with the materials and procedures delaying full implementation until mid-November.

Pupil Selection

Selection of pupils was based on teacher recommendations, reading achievement scores, and continuous progress reading levels. Several principals selected upper level pupils in need of skill reinforcement to reach level for graduation. In addition to pupils being enrolled in another ESEA reading program, priority was given to the lowest achievers who would benefit most. Immaturity and age were additional considerations. In some instances parental requests, other test results (i.e., criterion referenced tests, Stanford Diagnostic tests, readiness tests, and basal reader tests) were used for selection. One principal suggested the guidelines for participation should be changed so that any ESEA eligible pupil could participate in the daily instruction. The program would be more cost effective (serving more pupils) and the instruction more effective allowing the pupil component to be demonstrative and innovative in design.

ILP

Although there was no Individual Learning Plan objective for this activity in fiscal 1980, eleven RRS responding to an ESEA questionnnaire had some form of an individual pupil plan. These teachers indicated they communicated regularly with the classroom teachers, some daily, most weekly, and a few monthly. Some principals felt this communication helped to increase teacher awareness, coordinated instruction, and assisted in focusing on pupil's needs. It should be pointed out that the pupils in this program received reading instruction from two teachers and, in many instances, three---homeroom, RRS, and another ESEA reading program. Because of the potential adverse impact of two or three instructional styles and techniques, plus a wider variety of instructional materials than usual (for low achievers), it was paramount for teachers instructing the same child to communicate regularly.

Staffing

Of eleven teachers responded to a questionnaire, five had been in the program before, two since 1974. The remaining six were newly assigned. Principals were to select a teacher who had demonstrated special competency in teaching of reading to Title I pupils or who had special training in the teaching of reading. The selected teachers must also have possessed the ability to communicate effectively with a school's staff for local inservice meetings, classroom demonstrations and teacher training sessions in reading to produce the maximum staff development effect.

One principal commented, in the fall interview, that because there was a teacher on staff who was highly experienced, innovative, and an expert in developing reading programs, the RRS program was selected. Twenty-two principals responding to the spring Principal Evaluation Form rated their staff development manager as being very effective.

Sixteen aides responded to the spring Teacher Aide Questionnaire. Six had been in the program previously, one of them going back to 1974 and two to 1976. Four aides were assigned late to this program. The remaining aides were assigned by September 1979.

A majority of the aides indicated they spent at least half of their time working directly with the pupils. Several commented that training in the use of audiovisual equipment, dealing with minor discipline situations, conducting group practice and providing reinforcement in reading skills would have helped them perform their duties more effectively. These sample comments reflect the need for paraprofessional training. This staff development activity could be used to provide training to other aides in Title I programs as well.

Inservice

During fiscal 1980 several inservice meetings were scheduled. The initial inservice session in September was conducted by the vendor assisted by the citywide ESEA coordinator. Twenty-two of the twenty-nine RRS managers, responding to the quality of the vendor sponsored meeting, indicated it was better than adequate (23 percent), adequate (59 percent) and inadequate (9 percent). Nine percent made no comment. The remaining inservice meetings, conducted primarily by the ESEA coordinator, were rated as "good" to "very good". Speakers presented services and techniques that could be used for local school staff development and reading skill-building meetings. Teachers shared school inservice techniques as well as instructional materials that were helpful. The majority of teachers felt these inservice sessions helped them to improve their classroom instruction.

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Operating the tutorial component of this activity varied throughout the city. Some RRS teachers met once a day with all 15 pupils. Others met in two or more sessions with smaller groups. Most sessions took place during the morning. Programs observed in the fall were conducted in either regular-sized rooms, a mobile unit, storage rooms, an auditorium stage, a counseling office, a basement storage facility, or space shared with other ESEA programs and school personnel (IRIP, adjustment teacher). Make-shift space is not adequate for reading instruction intended to provide individualization.

The only equipment needed was a cassette player for local inservice programs. The use and service (if needed) of this cassette player was provided by the vendor at the initial inservice meeting. Overall, principals rated the local school inservice, activity materials, equiment and vendor service as average. Three administrators called the activity's inservice tapes worthless, that they were unrealistic, did not promote discussion, and were not stimulating. In many instances the "taped" program did not apply; school staff was better equipped to determine local needs and to plan inservice meetings accordingly.

Teachers also were critical of the inservice tapes: 32 percent rated them "inadequate", 32 percent "adequate", 18 percent "better than adequate", and 18 percent had no comments. The comments received on the spring questionnaires sent to managers had merit, particularly from the continuing RRS teachers. Teachers wanted a greater choice of materials germane to the urban inner-school learning situation. Funds for tapes for continuing schools could be spent better on instructional materials or other staff development sources for materials. The quality (not quantity) of the tapes was mentioned by several RRS managers. Many teachers took time to write comments regarding the tapes. One summed up the feeling of many teachers,

> "The taped programs are expensive and inadequate, especially if you've been in the program over four years. You end up selecting tapes merely to use the $1,000. The money can be better spent on bringing in speakers or for workshops where teachers get input. Then we can turn this information into worthwhile inservice sessions at the school. Little stimulation comes through the tapes."

The teachers also commented on the professional library, although not as critically. Some schools had difficulty receiving professional library shipments, some wanted other sources from which to select library books. One RRS teacher would have liked suggestions to encourage teachers to use the professional library. There were few complaints (other than quantity) regarding the instructional materials used in the reading groups. When teachers were involved in the selection of these instructional materials they were generally able to provide individualized instruction. At the same time they found it relatively easy to correlate these materials with the continuous progress curriculum. A few indicated the need for funds to purchase educational games and reading comprehension masters.

Most of the RRS teachers, responding to the Title I questionnaire, indicated that teacher training sessions at the local schools were "excellent" to "average" in all areas of staff development. Only one-third rated these inservice sessions as "fair" to "poor". Most program managers provided the required 15 hours of local school inservice during the year which helped to improve classroom instruction. The data suggests that one weak area was in providing adequate training to improve the aides' instructional activities with Title I pupils.

Efficiency of Operation

In all sites, pupils were observed doing the assigned tasks: 84 percent were involved in reading; 14 percent in language arts; and two percent in transition. Approximately 42 percent of the pupils were involved in whole group instruction. It would appear that any distractions that might have existed in the space used for the reading program caused no major delays in instructional time or "on task" performance. Workbooks and learning kits were materials most often observed in use.

Teachers were observed most often instructing a whole group. An equal portion of their time was used to instruct smaller groups or individuals and for general pupil supervision. The majority of the aide's time was spent in supervision or tutoring one pupil.

Aides responding to a questionnaire indicated they were actively and directly involved in working with pupils at least 50 percent of the time when classes were in session. The remainder of their time was occupied in record-keeping and preparing instructional materials.

Observations indicated and teachers and aides reported their being called upon to serve as substitutes for regular classroom teachers who were absent. In many cases, the substitute service was provided until a regular substitute arrived. Reading groups had to be cancelled due to inservice meetings, teacher illness, outdoor camping participation, and performing administrative duties. The majority of class cancellations (42 percent) were due to RRS teachers acting as substitute teachers.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The opportunity for parents to visit a RRS tutorial class would not be as convenient as most ESEA programs. In many schools, groups met between one to three periods a day, generally in the morning. However, the majority of parents appeared to cooperate with the RRS, indicating concern and interest in their children's progress. This is reflected by more than half the parents who indicated their children had achieved more in fiscal 1980 as a result of being in the program.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement data must be viewed with the understanding that the pupils in this program are also enrolled in another Title I reading activity. These pupils also receive reading instruction from their homeroom teacher. The impact and effect of these multiple instructional elements (teacher and material) can have both positive as well as negative implications. Participants in the RRS reading program were average for Title I pupils.

Tabulations of the achievement data discussed in this section can be found in Volume 2.

Table 1 illustrates the standardized test results for the RRS program in fiscal 1980. Achievement results from 21 public schools having 285 matched pre- and posttest scores are contained in Table 1.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=285)

Objective	Criterion	Activity Result	Objective Met
Vocabulary subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	56%	NO
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
-Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	57%	NO
-Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	YES

Pupils enrolled in the reading component of the RRS program achieved an average grade-equivalent gain of eight months in reading comprehension. The objective of eight months gain in reading comprehension for fiscal 1980 was achieved by a little more than half of the activity participants. The 60 percent criterion for achieving a standard score gain in reading comprehension and vocabulary was not met. The distribution of average grade-equivalent gains in the 21 public schools ranged from 2 months to 10 months in reading comprehension.

Age cycle ten had a positive standard score gain in both reading and vocabulary. The average gain score for upper level pupils (9 months) was higher than that for primary or intermediate level pupils. That upper level pupils showed the greatest achievement gain was consistent with the pattern observed for all Title I pupils.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

There were apprximately 435 pupils participating in the RRS staff development program at a total estimated cost of $1,193,628. The cost was considerably higher than one other staff development program, but only slightly higher than the third such activity which was similar in design.

The aide option in the RRS program, although beneficial, was not essential. Providing services to fifteen pupils each day was not cost effective in relation to the aide's designated daily duties and future budget considerations. The staff development content, as designed, included improving reading, instructional, and teaching skills during the 15 hours of inservice to each participating teacher. Vendor materials did not adequately meet teacher needs. Given the need to improve materials for school workshops, improve reading and vocabulary skills, and meet the guidelines, it would appear that RRS was not particularly cost-effective.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

RRS operated in 29 public schools for its sixth year as a Title I project. This program provided inservice training for eight to ten Title I teachers and teachers of Title I pupils. In addition, RRS provided daily supplementary reading instruction to 15 pupils enrolled in Title I reading activities.

Implementation posed few difficulties; however, delays were reported in aide assignments and minor delays occurred in materials delivery. Citywide inservice training was provided initially by the vendor and subsequently by the citywide ESEA coordinator. These citywide meetings were more favorably received by RRS teachers than the vendor session. Teacher aides in the program indicated that specific inservice training would have helped them in performing their tasks.

A variety of facilities served as instructional settings for pupils in the reading component: classrooms, a mobile unit, storage rooms, an auditorium, a counseling office, a basement storage room, and shared space.

Critical comments were received from program managers, especially those continuing in the program, concerning the value, quality, and quantity of the cassette tapes. The tapes did not serve the needs of many schools; RRS managers indicating they did not provide techniques for teaching reading skills. One school indicated the professional library was delivered late. Several schools mentioned the infrequent use of the professional library.

R&E #41
Project #609
Program #7641
Evaluator: John Brunetti

NEW EDUCATIONAL DIRECTIONS

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Only two schools implemented the New Educational Directions activity (NED) in fiscal 1980, in its sixth year in Chicago's Title I project as a staff development program. This activity provided a teacher-manager and teacher aide to serve 25 or 40 Title I teachers, teachers of Title I pupils, teacher aides, and 20 Title I pupils in a resource laboratory center. Each participating teacher was to use the laboratory for the creation of criterion-referenced instruction materials for 45 minutes weekly. Additional work periods in the laboratory were to be encouraged.

The teacher-manager and aide were to use the management program of the Pacific Learning Services to reinforce and improve the teachers' skills in diagnosing, prescribing, and individualizing instruction in reading and mathematics. Teachers would participate in a series of learning activities based on 15 classroom management objectives, each with criterion-referenced pre- and posttests, reading practice activities, discussion topics, and texts.

The resource center simulated an individualized learning laboratory with appropriate educational furnishings and fixtures. The center was to include the following stations with room dividers for participant instruction:

- -Planning station
- -Independent study station
- -Audiovisual station
- -Teacher manager station
- -Resource station
- -Testing station
- -Tutorial station

NED also offered the opportunity for administration and staff to plan long- and short-range goals and to establish better staff relationships.

A five-day management training program was to be conducted by Pacific Learning Services.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

In fiscal 1980 only two Title I schools selected this staff development activity. In one school, this activity provided a teacher-manager and resource center for 25 Title I teachers or teachers of Title I pupils and their respective aides; the other school chose to use it for 40 teachers and aides.

Initiation of Instruction

One school's activity was fully implemented in early September, the other by October. Teacher-managers and aides were assigned from the school's staff at the beginning of the school year. The adult component involving teacher training and the pupil classes offering reading instruction to intermediate and upper age cycle pupils had started. Pupil participants received reading instruction daily for one hour. The balance of the teacher day was spent with the adult teacher component in the creation of instructional tools and teaching materials to satisfy the needs of their pupils.

Pupils were selected in September from the Title I eligible list and those who had participated in Title I activities in the current or in the previous year.

Inservice

Out-of-school inservice sessions were held prior to the implementation of the program. The inservice included a three-day workshop on the operation of the center, a one-day conference with the company representatives, and a one-day on site visit of the program. The vendor representatives were consultants and teachers who had long experience in the activity and were thoroughly trained in both the methodology and instructional psychology underlying this kind of teaching. Teacher-managers stated that the most effective component of the total inservice package was the on-site inservice meeting where the vendor consultant met with the teachers being trained, offering instruction and working with them individually. Principals evaluated NED as meeting the schools' objectives but felt the vendor inservices were average.

NED's pupil participants served as a demonstration class for other teachers. Inservices reinforced and improved the teachers' skills in diagnosing, prescribing, and individualizing instruction in reading and mathematics. The laboratory resembled a supermarket of learning experiences.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Observations showed this activity was provided with adequate facilities. In both NED schools, adult and pupil classes met in large, modern, well-lighted, and well-equipped classrooms. Adequate files and other organized storage facilities were on hand to accommodate the large variety of materials that the teachers and children used daily. All of the necessary materials to begin operation of the activity were delivered by the vendor before October.

Principals rated the equipment in the NED labs as average but rated materials as excellent. These ratings were the highest for all Title I staff development activities.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupil achievement gains should not be viewed in the same manner as for a regular Title I reading activity. NED was a staff development activity in which the reading materials developed were used to train teachers. The reading effects cited were not solely the results of this staff develpment activity as these pupils were enrolled in another Title I instructional activity as well.

Based on pretest standard scores, the pupils placed in these demonstration classes were higher achievers than average for Title I. Overall these pupils met all the ITBS achievement objectives: that the pupils achieve an eight month gain in reading comprehension and that 60 percent of the pupils have standard score gains in reading and vocabulary. Pupils in this activity averaged 1.3 grade-equivalent months of gain in reading comprehension. Almost all of them had standard score gains, i.e., 95 percent in reading comprehension and 85 percent in vocabulary. It should be emphasized that these mean gains were based on the matched ITBS scores of only 13 pupils at one of the two participating schools. More information on achievement can be found in Volume 2.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total cost for the NED activity was $109,485 or approximately $1,700 per participating teacher. Supplies were allocated at the rate of six dollars per pupil or $120 per school.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Fiscal 1980 marked the last year for this activity in Chicago's Title I project. While in operation, several learning laboratories were established and became functional under teachers who received training. Achievement results were relatively high. The activity did train teachers in the techniques of the student-centered learning process of Pacific Learning Laboratories.

R&E #49
Project #571
Program #2491
Evaluator: John Brunetti

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

Educational Leadership Institute (ELI), a staff development activity, was purchased by 35 schools in fiscal 1980. In its fourth year of operation, ELI provided services to approximately 280 teachers and served 750 primary, intermediate, and upper level pupils in small group reading and mathematics experiences. At ten of the 35 schools ELI served only teachers. At schools continuing ELI from the previous year, principals also selected eight to ten parents for participation in five one-day workshops to assist them in the instruction of their children at home.

ELI used the programs and services of the Educational Leadership Institute. The principals, teachers, and parents participated in training activities designed to improve classroom management skills and to improve the school's instructional program in general.

A teacher/coordinator was to be given the responsibility for the planning, implementation, and coordination of the staff development program at each school. A member of the school advisory council was to assist the teacher/coordinator in this process and to maintain communication between the school, parents, and community members. A total of 15 hours of inservice meetings were scheduled. The principal was to provide instructional leadership and support to the staff members participating in ELI. School staff were to receive 10 to 18 days of inservice.

ACTIVITY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Program Selection

All principals of Title I schools were interviewed. More than half of the principals who selected the ELI activity said they did so because ELI had been an effective activity in their schools in previous years. Many principals claimed that their teachers needed a staff development program to improve intra-school communication.

Others made it a point to select ELI to improve teachers' classroom management procedures. All the schools which selected the pupil instructional component of the activity wanted a competent, experienced reading teacher to work with a limited number of pupils with serious reading problems.

At some schools principals desired an additional teacher to coordinate Title I activities. Overall, the ELI activity seemed to meet a variety of local school needs.

Staffing

Principals indicated that they selected teachers to lead ELI who were of above average ability. A majority of the ELI teachers had served at their schools for more than five years. However, the average number of years these teachers had spent instructing Title I classes was about two years.

Inservice Training

More than 90 percent of the ELI teachers responding to the Teacher Questionnnaire rated the vendor's inservice sessions and the district level meetings as good or very good. Meetings organized by central office and local school staff were also rated good or very good by the majority of the participating teachers. ELI teachers (94 percent) indicated that the vendor's inservice sessions had improved their skills in properly operating the activity.

Local school staff meetings were considered beneficial by the school staff, which included both Title I and board-funded teachers.

A majority of the principals responding felt that the ELI inservice sessions were above average. They gave as their reason the emphasis on improving teachers' attitudes and on increased communication among staff, parents, and pupils.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Facilities, Equipment, and Materials

Approximately 90 percent of the ELI classrooms observed were conducted in rooms which were not shared with another class. However, about 30 percent of the observed classes were being conducted in rooms which were not regular classrooms. ELI teachers did not complain about these conditions. Half of the classroom facilities observed were rated average as far as their physical environment was concerned. Several were rated below average.

Thirty-three percent were rated above average because pupils' current work was displayed, bulletin board materials were relevant and timely, and the rooms were well organized. A majority of the schools maintaing ELI activities were rated above average because of the efficient management of the school sites.

When asked to rate the ELI materials and equipment, principals judged them to be above average. In concord with the principals' ratings, a majority (88 percent) of the ELI teachers reported that instructional materials were provided in adequate quantity for all pupil achievement levels. Most rated the quality of the materials as good or excellent. However, only a little more than 70 percent said they received Title I consumable supplies in sufficient quantity.

ELI teachers were able to individualize instruction with the available materials. Many also indicated that they had been involved in the selection of pupils' instructional materials. Most thought that the correlation of the ELI instrtuctional materials with the Chicago CP/ML continuum was quite good.

In the observed classrooms more than half of the pupils were working with various kinds of instructional materials or manipulatives. The remaining pupils were engaged in listening or watching activities.

Efficiency of Operation

In the pupil instruction component of ELI, 83 percent of the teachers observed were rated to be above average in giving clear assignments and directions, in adapting lessons to pupils' levels, and in creating a personal atmosphere which allowed some pupils to work efficiently. Many (66 percent) of these teachers were observed giving individualized instruction. However, the overall teacher effect on classroom management was rated only average for half of the observed classes. In approximately 20 percent of the classes this teacher effect received a below average rating. This may reflect the fact that 24 percent of the ELI teachers were undecided or not willing to teach in the activity again the following year.

During the first semester, observations of ELI classrooms revealed that approximately 84 percent of the pupils were working on their assigned tasks and that six percent were waiting for an assignment. The observations conducted in the second semester showed that all pupils were working at their assigned tasks.

Pupil Responses

ELI teachers rated a majority of their pupils (88 percent) as actively and cooperatively involved in the classroom activities. Only six percent of the pupils were interested but not actively involved, and the remaining six percent were judged completely uninterested.

Staff Communication

Ninety percent of the ELI teachers who responded to a questionnaire indicated that they communicated regularly with non-Title I staff about their pupils' achievement and progress. Usually, the ELI teachers (47 percent) met with the board-funded teacher of the pupils weekly. A third met daily. The remainder indicated fewer meetings: once a month or less frequently. All these meetings were reported to be informal.

Maintaining pupils' ILPs was, at most schools, shared by the ELI and board-funded teachers. A few ELI teachers reported they were solely responsible for this task.

Communication between the home and the school was maintained through the ELI parent inservices and through the services of the School-Community Representatives (SCRs) at those schools having them. More than half of the ELI teachers said the SCRs made them more aware of their pupils' home environments and their instructional needs. On the other hand, 23 percent were not sure if the SCRs were useful and 15 percent were unaware of the SCRs' services.

PARENT INVOVLEMENT

ELI teachers indicated that 41 percent of the parents were actively and cooperatively involved in the activity, 47 percent were interested but not active, and 15 percent were uninterested. These results were about average for Title I activities.

Almost all (93 percent) of the parents responding to a parent questionnaire were aware that their children participated in a Title I activity. This exceeded the evaluation objective of 90 percent.

Ninety percent of the parents said that they had visited their children's regular classrooms. Approximately 70 percent reported that they had visited the ELI classroom. This exceeded the evaluation objective of 60 percent.

Additional data on parent involvement revealed that 93 percent of the parents had assisted their children more than they had in the previous school year. About 80 percent of the parents thought that their children achieved more academically because they participated in ELI. Finally, all the parents agreed that the activity should be continued.

PARTICIPANT ACHIEVEMENT

Pupils chosen to participate in ELI were to be those judged, by the principal and teachers, as being most in need of additional assistance. In fact, the average pupil in ELI had a higher standard score on the ITBS than the average for all Title I pupils suggesting that in the majority of cases the participating pupils were not the most in need. This was especially true of primary level pupils.

As may be seen in Table 1, only the eight month achievement objectives were met. An examination of the tables in Volume 2 reveals great inconsistency between age cycles. Age cycle eight pupils achieved an average gain of only three grade-equivalent months while age cycle thirteen gained 1.2 grade-equivalent years. Differences between school averages were also large, ranging from one month to 2.2 years in grade-equivalent gain and from 33 to 92 percent of the pupils achieving standard score gains. One school which had selected ELI for 30 pupils had pre- and posttest scores for 124 pupils, suggesting that individual pupils were not served for an entire year but that pupils were rotated through the ELI activity.

TABLE 1. ITBS ACTIVITY OBJECTIVES (N=731)

Objective	Criterion	Activity result	Objective met
Vocabulary subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	52%	no
Reading Comprehension subtest:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	57%	no
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	yes
Mathematics Total:			
- Percent with Standard Score gains	60%	55%	no
- Mean grade-equivalent gain	8 mos.	8 mos.	yes

Some schools served pupils in kindergarten and the first year beyond kindewrgarten who were tested with the CTBS. Both groups had mean scores in the low-average range nationally. The relevant evaluation objective required 45 percent of the age cycle five and 40 percent of the age cycle six pupils to obtain reading scores above the national average. Only 13 percent of the five-year-olds and 24 percent of the six-year-olds met this objective. These data suggest that ELI inadequately met the needs of kindergarten and young primary level pupils.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Because some schools used the pupil instruction option and some not, cost effectiveness was difficult to assess for ELI. The estimated total cost of $1,128,792 was high for a staff development activity.

The cost per unit for the options offering direct pupil instruction was approximately three times the amount for the options providing the staff development services only. Clearly, without the pupil option, ELI's total cost would be considerably reduced. The best estimate of the per pupil cost for ELI places it among the most expensive of all Title I activities. Since the academic achievement of the participating pupils as measured by standardized tests was not outstanding, it seems probable that ELI was not particularly cost effective.

No good measure of the productivity of staff development activities which did not use direct pupil instruction was available. Consequently, the cost effectivenss of these options could not be determined.

SUMMARY, COMMENTS, AND CONCLUSIONS

ELI obviously served a need since principals were eager to select it and praised the vendor's services. However, it is not clear from this evaluation what need was served. The pupils selected to participate in general did not appear to be those most in need of remediation. Nor were pupils' achievement gains better than those observed in many other Title I activities.

Very little is known of the uses to which ELI was put in those schools not implementing the instructional option other than that the participating teachers seemed mildly positive. It appears, from observations and staff comments, that at some schools ELI was used mainly to support a person to coordinate Title I activities and teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ELI option in which the teacher/manager also instructs 30 pupils should be limited to upper cycle pupils.

In the pupil option, ELI teacher/managers should accept greater responsibility for the progress of the pupils assigned to them.

ELI, as implemented in fiscal 1980, was only occasionally capable of meeting the needs of the Title I population at particular schools. If a more effective activity is available, ELI should be replaced.

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND LONG RANGE PLANNING

Bureau of ESEA Program Evaluation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION--FISCAL 1980:

ACTIVITY REPORTS

Volume 2: Statistical Tables

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Schuster
Chicago Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr. Ruth B. Love
General Superintendent of Schools
Board of Education of the City of Chicago

May 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Explanation of Tables v
  ITBS Tables v
  CTBS Tables vii
Percentile to NCE (Chicago Standard Score) Conversion Table ix

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT TABLES

READING LABORATORY ACTIVITIES

Computer-Assisted Instruction: Reading 1
Programmed Reading Instructional System 2
Language Arts Reinforcement Center 4
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Reading 6
Improving Reading Achievement through the Teaching of Typewriting 7
Hoffman's ME-dia System: Reading 8
System 80 Program: Language Arts 10
Prescription Learning: Reading 12
High Intensity Centers: Reading 14
Multimedia Audiovisual Readiness Kindergarten Program 15
New Century Basic Skills: Reading 17

READING PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES

Teaching Reading Skills through Drama 18
An Eclectic Approach to Corrective and Remedial Reading Instruction 19
Behavioral Research Laboratories/Sullivan Reading Program 21
Scott, Foresman Reading System 23
Open Court Correlated Language Arts Program . . 24
Open Court Remedial Reading Program 26
EMC Corporation/Schmerler: Phonetic/Linguistic Reading and Language Program 27
BFA Comprehension/Vocabulary Program 28
SRA Corrective Reading Program 29
Support Systems for Individualized Reading . . 30
Language in Transition 32
Teaching Reading through Literature with the Newbery Award Series 34

SELF-CONTAINED ACTIVITIES

A Kindergarten and Primary Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing 35
An Intermediate and Upper Level Program of Individualized Instruction with Augmented Staffing 38
Encyclopaedia Britannica's Language Experiences in Reading 40
Crane Reading System 43
DISTAR Program in Reading and Language 46
Early Intervention: A Preschool and Kindergarten Activity 49
Instructional Team Schools 50
Child-Parent Centers 53
Follow Through 54

MATHEMATICS LABORATORY ACTIVITIES

Computer-Assisted Instruction: Mathematics 57
Audio-Tutorial Laboratory for Individual Progress: Mathematics 58
System 80 Program: Mathematics 59
Prescription Learning: Mathematics 61
High Intensity Centers: Mathematics 62
Mathematics Laboratory for the Development of Computational Skills 63
Alternative Instructional Mathematics System 64

MATHEMATICS PULL-OUT ACTIVITIES

Individualized Mathematics Instruction: An Eclectic Approach to Remedial Mathematics Instruction 65
Individualized Mathematics Instruction: Wynroth Math Program 66
Pre-Algebra Development Centers 68

ACTIVITIES SERVING SPECIAL NEEDS

Career Guidance Laboratory 69
Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading: Art 71
Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading: Science 72
Instructional Laboratories for the Teaching of Reading: Creative Arts 73

Bilingual Education Multimedia Instruction 74
Basic Occupational and Skill Training 77
Parent Plus Project 79
Institute for Parent Involvement 80
Staff Development through a Local School Reading Resource Specialist 81
New Educational Directions 82
Educational Leadership Institute 83

EXPLANATION OF TABLES

The tables which follow report on the progress of Title I pupils in fiscal year 1980 as measured by the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills.

At least one table is presented for each Title I instructional activity. For activities teaching reading, ITBS Reading Comprehension subtest results are provided; for activities teaching mathematics, the results of the ITBS Mathematics Total subtest appear; and for those activities which provide instruction in both reading and mathematics, results of both subtests are presented. For activities which enrolled pupils in kindergarten or the first year of school after kindergarten, tables of the CTBS results are provided. Activities enrolling preschool pupils used the Chicago EARLY Assessment. These results appear in the individual activity narratives in Volume 1 of this report.

The tables contain information only for pupils known to have participated for at least eight months in the same Title I activity at the same school. Information for pupils enrolled at non-public schools participating in Title I is not included.

ITBS tables:

Results appear for each age cycle and for all pupils in the activity. The averages for age cycle 14 also include the scores of a few pupils of age cycle 15.

The first column of each table indicates the age cycle and the associated instructional level to which the results in each horizontal line apply. For instance, the first entry in this column may read "PRIMARY" indicating the age cycles usually considered to be part of the primary instructional level. Below the primary age cycles, 7 and/or 8, there is a line marked "TOTAL" which gives the average for all the primary age cycles. This format is repeated for the intermediate and upper levels. At the bottom of the table, the line "ALL PUPILS" provides the totals and averages for all pupils in the activity.

The second column reports the number of pupils identified as participants in the activity according to the Pupil Enrollment Form completed at the schools in fiscal 1980.

The three columns headed "GRADE EQUIVALENT" give the pretest average for all Title I pupils in the activity who took the May 1979 test, the posttest average for all pupils who took the May 1980 test, and the average gain score for all pupils who took both tests. Grade equivalents are written in grade-equivalent years. In parentheses below the grade equivalents appears the number of pupils whose scores were used to calculate the averages. The number of pupils for whom gains could be computed is usually less than the number of pupils who took either the pre- or posttest. If no test scores existed for any pupils in an age cycle, "NO TEST DATA COULD BE LOCATED" is printed.

The fiscal 1980 evaluation called for an average of at least 0.8 grade-equivalent years of gain. Two asterisks are printed alongside the gain average if the objective was met. (A gain of 0.8 years sometimes has asterisks printed, sometimes not. This is caused by rounding. If asterisks appear, the gain before rounding equalled or exceeded 0.8 years; if no asterisks appear, the gain before rounding fell between 0.75 and 0.79 years.)

The next two columns present "MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES." NCE is the acronym for "Normal Curve Equivalent". NCEs are standard scores which indicate whether or not pupils have advanced more than their age cycle peers. These standard scores are based on the May 1975 distribution of ITBS scores for all pupils citywide. The average score at each age cycle that year was set to 250, the standard deviation to 21.06, the lowest score to 201, and the highest to 299.

The advantage of NCE scores is that they permit comparison between pupils of different ages. For example, if the pretest average for 9-year-olds was 240 and that for 12-year-olds 235, this means that, at the time of assignment to Title I, the 9-year-olds in the activity were doing better than the 12-year-olds. That is to say, the 9-year-olds were performing closer to the average for all pupils of age cycle 9 in the city than were the 12-year-olds with respect to all pupils of that age in the city.

These standard scores may be converted to percentile ranks based on the citywide distribution. An age-cycle NCE average of 235, for example, corresponds to the 24th percentile, indicating that the average pupil performed better than 24 percent of all pupils citywide at that age cycle. A table to convert NCEs to percentile ranks follows this explanation.

The last column presents the proportion of pupils who made gains in terms of the standard scores. That is, it counts up and gives the percentage of pupils who improved their percentile rank placements between the pre- and posttest. Any pupils whose pretest standard scores were below the city average of 250--typically true of Title I pupils--and whose percentile ranks improved between the pre- and posttests, quite clearly closed the "achievement gap" between themselves and the average pupil citywide.

The fiscal 1980 evaluation required that 60 percent of all participating pupils make standard score gains. If this objective was met, two asterisks are printed alongside the percentage. (As with the grade-equivalent objective, rounding caused some entries of 60 percent to have the asterisks and some not. Only for those entries with asterisks was the objective met. An entry of 60 percent without asterisks indicates that the objective was nearly met: the actual percentage of pupils with gains in such cases varied between 59.5 and 59.9 percent.)

The number of pupils whose scores were used to compute the standard score averages is not printed. It is in all cases the same as the number of cases appearing in parentheses in the grade-equivalent gain column.

CTBS tables:

The CTBS was administered only to Title I pupils of age cycles five and six and only in May 1980. Gains can therefore not be calculated. Rather, these tables permit comparison of the results for each activity to the results for all pupils tested.

The first entry in these tables provides the total number of pupils at each age cycle tested with the pre-reading, reading, or mathematics subtest as appropriate for the activity. Next, the number of pupils whose scores fell into each stanine is given. These are the stanines of the national normative distribution, not the local distribution used for the ITBS tables. For each activity and age cycle, the average standard score and the percent of pupils who scored above the national average are provided.

At the bottom of the table the national standard score average, the average for all Chicago Title I pupils, the percent of all Chicago Title I pupils who scored above the national average, and the total number of pupils tested are presented.

The distribution of the standard scores nationally ranges from a low of 1 to a high of 99 with an average of 50. These standard scores too may be converted to percentile ranks using the conversion table which follows. In this instance, add 200 to each standard score average and use this value to obtain the approximate percentile rank from the conversion table.

PERCENTILE TO NCE (CHICAGO STANDARD SCORE) CONVERSION TABLE

%ile	NCE	%ile	NCE
1	201	51	251
2	207	52	251
3	210	53	252
4	213	54	252
5	215	55	253
6	217	56	253
7	218	57	254
8	220	58	254
9	222	59	255
10	223	60	255
11	224	61	256
12	225	62	256
13	226	63	257
14	227	64	258
15	228	65	258
16	229	66	259
17	230	67	259
18	231	68	260
19	232	69	260
20	232	70	261
21	233	71	262
22	234	72	262
23	234	73	263
24	235	74	264
25	236	75	264
26	236	76	265
27	237	77	266
28	238	78	266
29	238	79	267
30	239	80	268
31	240	81	268
32	240	82	269
33	241	83	270
34	241	84	271
35	242	85	272
36	242	86	273
37	243	87	274
38	244	88	275
39	244	89	276
40	245	90	277
41	245	91	278
42	246	92	280
43	246	93	281
44	247	94	283
45	247	95	285
46	248	96	287
47	248	97	290
48	249	98	293
49	249	99	299
50	250		

PUPIL
ACHIEVEMENT
TABLES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (6)
COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION - READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED TO TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	1	NO TEST DATA COULD BE LOCATED					
8	59	2.7 (46)	3.3 (49)	.6 (47)	249	248	40
TOTAL:	59			.6	249	248	40
INTERMEDIATE							
9	872	3.0 (757)	3.4 (796)	.5 (706)	242	242	48
10	1490	3.3 (1310)	3.8 (1365)	.5 (1240)	240	240	46
11	1855	3.8 (1656)	4.5 (1725)	.7 (1571)	239	241	55
TOTAL:	4217			.6	240	241	51
UPPER							
12	1428	4.1 (1259)	4.9 (1316)	.8 ** (1207)	237	240	57
13	745	4.5 (661)	5.4 (687)	.9 ** (642)	236	238	59
14	297	4.6 (262)	5.4 (276)	.8 (252)	231	234	65 **
TOTAL:	2470			.8 **	236	239	59
ALL PUPILS	6746			.7 (5661)	239	240	54

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (19)
PROGRAMMED READING INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
PRIMARY							
7	189	1.6	2.2	.7	243	241	42
		(19)	(155)	(19)			
8	236	2.1	2.8	.7	237	240	59
		(189)	(212)	(171)			
TOTAL:	425			.7	238	240	57
INTERMEDIATE							
9	145	2.3	3.0	.6	232	236	56
		(121)	(129)	(111)			
10	86	3.1	4.2	1.0 **	238	245	69 **
		(72)	(76)	(64)			
11	36	3.0	3.9	.9 **	229	234	69 **
		(30)	(33)	(29)			
TOTAL:	267			.8 **	233	238	63 **
UPPER							
12	39	3.5	4.2	.8 **	230	233	65 **
		(36)	(37)	(34)			
13	72	4.7	5.6	.9 **	237	240	63 **
		(69)	(69)	(68)			
14	14	4.6	5.8	1.0 **	232	237	73 **
		(13)	(11)	(11)			
TOTAL:	125			.9 **	234	236	65 **
ALL PUPILS	817			.8 **	235	239	61 **
				(507)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
PROGRAMMED READING SYSTEM					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		24	M	64	M
	1	4	M	5	M
	2	4	M	6	M
	3	7	M	17	M
	4	8	M	13	M
	5	1	M	19	M
	6	0	M	4	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		29.1	M	36.2	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		0.0	M	20.3	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (31)
LANGUAGE ARTS REINFORCEMENT CENTER

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	163	2.6 (14)	2.9 (141)	.3 (14)	266	252	21
8	174	2.0 (139)	2.8 (158)	.8 (131)	236	240	59
TOTAL:	337			.7	239	241	55
INTERMEDIATE							
9	160	2.5 (136)	2.9 (151)	.4 (131)	235	235	58
10	162	3.1 (152)	3.3 (158)	.6 (148)	238	239	54
11	167	3.7 (144)	4.4 (153)	.6 (137)	239	240	53
TOTAL:	489			.6	237	238	55
UPPER							
12	129	4.4 (115)	5.2 (118)	.8 ** (105)	239	242	56
13	120	4.6 (102)	5.8 (114)	1.0 ** (97)	238	241	64 **
14	31	4.7 (25)	5.5 (30)	.7 (24)	233	235	58
TOTAL:	280			.9 **	238	241	59
ALL PUPILS	1106			.7 (790)	236	239	56

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
LARC					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	67	29
	1	M	M	11	4
	2	M	M	11	5
	3	M	M	9	10
	4	M	M	10	5
	5	M	M	5	4
	6	M	M	8	1
	7	M	M	7	0
	8	M	M	5	0
	9	M	M	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	40.0	29.9
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	37.3	13.8
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

```
                   1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
                   DISTRICT 17 UNIT  5610  REVERE

                            ACTIVITY (36)
      AUTO-TUTORIAL LABORATORY FOR INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS :  READING

                     ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

     LEVEL/  PUPILS          GRADE                  MATCHED CHICAGO  % HAVING
     AGE    REPORTED     EQUIVALENT                  AGE SCORES      POSITIVE
               IN                                                    STANDARD
            TITLE I  PRE-  POST- GAIN               PRE-  POST-       SCORE
            ACTIVITY TEST  TEST  SCORE              TEST  TEST        GAIN

     PRIMARY

        8        7     2.2   2.5    .4              233   234          43
                     (   7)(   7)(   7)

     TOTAL:      7                  .4              233   234          43

     INTERMEDIATE

        9        7     2.4   3.3    .9 **           231   237          71 **
                     (   7)(   7)(   7)

       10        9     4.2   4.8    .7              254   253          25
                     (   8)(   9)(   8)

       11       11     4.6   5.3    .7              251   250          50
                     (  10)(  11)(  10)

     TOTAL:     27                  .8              245   248          48

     UPPER

       12        1     2.1   3.1   1.0 **           214   221         100 **
                     (   1)(   1)(   1)

       13        1     5.9   5.6   -.3              255   245           0
                     (   1)(   1)(   1)

     TOTAL:      2                  .3              235   233          50

      ALL
     PUPILS     36                  .7              244   244          47
                                 (  34)

     ** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
     NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES
```

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (F1)
IMPROVING READING ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH THE TEACHING OF TYPEWRITING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
9	13	3.3 (12)	3.7 (12)	.5 (11)	246	246	55
10	116	3.2 (107)	3.9 (110)	.8 (100)	239	242	61 **
11	401	4.0 (367)	4.7 (373)	.8 (347)	242	244	58
TOTAL:	530			.9	241	243	59
UPPER							
12	569	4.7 (542)	5.5 (544)	.8 ** (513)	243	245	56
13	605	5.0 (558)	6.0 (561)	1.0 ** (530)	240	244	68 **
14	320	4.9 (271)	5.9 (284)	1.1 ** (262)	233	239	73 **
TOTAL:	1494			1.0 **	240	243	64 **
ALL PUPILS	2024			.9 ** (1763)	240	243	63 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (71)
HOFFMAN'S ME-DIA SYSTEM : READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	49	2.4 (8)	2.8 (45)	.2 (8)	261	246	37
8	144	2.3 (126)	3.0 (128)	.7 (117)	241	242	50
TOTAL:	193			.6	243	243	49
INTERMEDIATE							
9	116	2.6 (104)	3.1 (114)	.5 (104)	237	238	51
10	143	2.8 (125)	3.4 (134)	.6 (119)	233	235	55
11	82	3.6 (74)	4.3 (75)	.7 (69)	238	240	51
TOTAL:	341			.6	236	237	53
UPPER							
12	51	4.1 (47)	5.0 (49)	.9 ** (45)	237	240	71 **
13	49	4.7 (46)	5.5 (49)	.8 (46)	237	239	43
14	22	4.9 (19)	6.0 (21)	1.0 ** (19)	233	238	74 **
TOTAL:	122			.9 **	237	239	62 **
ALL PUPILS	656			.7 (527)	237	239	54

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
HOFFMAN MEDIA: READING					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	25	3
	3	M	M	3	0
	4	M	M	6	0
	5	M	M	10	0
	6	M	M	6	3
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	47.5	62.5
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	44.0	100.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (3)
SYSTEM 80 PROGRAM - LANGUAGE ARTS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	183	1.7	2.0	.3	246	235	31
		(16)	(160)	(16)			
8	287	2.3	2.6	.3	241	235	37
		(222)	(246)	(193)			
TOTAL:	470			.3	241	235	37
INTERMEDIATE							
9	181	2.6	3.1	.5	236	237	53
		(159)	(169)	(150)			
10	123	3.0	3.6	.5	237	237	51
		(105)	(116)	(101)			
11	107	3.6	4.2	.5	238	238	53
		(91)	(98)	(88)			
TOTAL:	411			.5	237	237	52
UPPER							
12	40	3.6	4.1	.6	232	233	49
		(40)	(39)	(39)			
13	24	3.6	4.3	.7	226	228	65 **
		(23)	(23)	(23)			
14	2	4.2	4.6	.4	227	227	50
		(2)	(2)	(2)			
TOTAL:	66			.6	229	231	55
ALL PUPILS	947			.4	236	236	47
				(612)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
SYSTEM 80: LANGUAGE ARTS					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		27	1	112	16
	1	0	0	3	2
	2	1	1	10	4
	3	1	0	30	2
	4	12	0	37	3
	5	9	0	23	4
	6	4	0	8	0
	7	0	0	1	1
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		45.1	18.5	37.3	32.9
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		18.5	0.0	14.3	12.5
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (1)
PRESCRIPTION LEARNING - READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	549	2.0	2.4	.9 **	252	253	45
		(120)	(477)	(106)			
8	854	2.2	2.6	.7	239	240	50
		(704)	(786)	(666)			
TOTAL:	1403			.7	241	242	50
INTERMEDIATE							
9	1400	2.7	3.3	.6	238	240	55
		(1247)	(1384)	(1170)			
10	1594	3.1	3.8	.7	237	239	57
		(1427)	(1489)	(1359)			
11	1605	3.6	4.4	.7	237	240	57
		(1431)	(1503)	(1401)			
TOTAL:	4599			.7	237	240	57
UPPER							
12	1582	4.4	5.3	.9 **	240	243	64 **
		(1472)	(1467)	(1393)			
13	1573	5.0	6.1	1.2 **	240	244	63 **
		(1471)	(1471)	(1404)			
14	559	4.9	5.9	1.0 **	234	239	68 **
		(522)	(528)	(502)			
TOTAL:	3713			1.0 **	239	243	66 **
ALL PUPILS	9715			.9 **	238	241	60 **
				(8001)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
PRESCRIPTION LEARNING					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	20	1
	1	M	M	2	0
	2	M	M	2	0
	3	M	M	2	0
	5	M	M	4	1
	6	M	M	8	0
	7	M	M	1	0
	8	M	M	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	47.3	48.8
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	59.1	0.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (92)
HIGH INTENSITY CENTERS - READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
8	102	2.1	2.6	.5	236	236	43
		(91)	(93)	(86)			
TOTAL:	102			.5	236	236	43
INTERMEDIATE							
9	226	2.8	3.5	.6	240	243	59
		(199)	(208)	(188)			
10	214	3.1	3.8	.8	237	240	63 **
		(191)	(195)	(179)			
11	136	3.7	4.5	.7	239	240	53
		(122)	(126)	(115)			
TOTAL:	576			.7	238	241	59
UPPER							
12	121	4.6	5.5	.9 **	242	245	63 **
		(109)	(112)	(104)			
13	109	5.1	6.0	.9 **	241	243	60 **
		(102)	(107)	(101)			
14	53	5.3	6.2	.9 **	236	242	66 **
		(48)	(51)	(47)			
TOTAL:	283			.9 **	241	244	63 **
ALL PUPILS	961			.7	239	241	58
				(820)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (P2)
THE READING GAME SOUND SYSTEM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	58	1.8	2.2	.4	249	239	0
		(2)	(36)	(2)			
8	25	2.1	2.7	.3	239	233	38
		(16)	(21)	(13)			
TOTAL:	83			.3	240	234	33
INTERMEDIATE							
9	3	2.2	2.7	.5	234	235	50
		(2)	(2)	(2)			
TOTAL:	3			.5	234	235	50
ALL PUPILS	86			.3	240	234	35
				(17)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
MARK					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		91	M	38	M
	1	8	M	3	M
	2	11	M	3	M
	3	27	M	9	M
	4	25	M	10	M
	5	14	M	10	M
	6	4	M	1	M
	7	1	M	2	M
	8	1	M	0	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		34.1	M	36.6	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		14.1	M	13.2	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (97)
NEW CENTURY BASIC SKILLS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
10	5	3.2 (4)	4.2 (5)	.8 (4)	238	241	75 **
11	26	4.0 (24)	5.2 (26)	1.4 ** (24)	242	250	62 **
TOTAL:	31			1.3 **	241	249	64 **
UPPER							
12	59	4.5 (57)	6.1 (55)	1.6 ** (55)	241	250	71 **
13	134	4.9 (122)	6.2 (125)	1.3 ** (117)	238	244	78 **
14	65	4.8 (61)	6.1 (63)	1.3 ** (59)	233	240	78 **
TOTAL:	259			1.4 **	237	245	76 **
ALL PUPILS	289			1.4 ** (259)	236	245	75 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (33)
TEACHING READING SKILLS THROUGH DRAMA

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	
PRIMARY							
8	8	3.4 (6)	3.3 (8)	.3 (6)	261	255	33
TOTAL:	8			.3	261	255	33
INTERMEDIATE							
9	19	3.3 (14)	3.8 (18)	.6 (14)	249	250	36
10	70	3.7 (62)	4.1 (64)	.9 ** (60)	240	244	58
11	184	3.9 (173)	4.6 (171)	.7 (167)	241	242	54
TOTAL:	273			.7	241	243	54
UPPER							
12	217	4.5 (196)	5.3 (197)	.7 (184)	242	243	51
13	160	5.2 (149)	6.1 (148)	.9 ** (141)	242	244	61 **
14	38	5.3 (38)	6.3 (37)	.9 ** (37)	239	243	70 **
TOTAL:	415			.9 **	242	243	57
ALL PUPILS	696			.8 (609)	242	243	55

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (91)
AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO CORRECTIVE AND REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTI

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	1000	1.7	2.1	.6	246	241	36
		(135)	(872)	(128)			
8	1186	2.0	2.6	.7	235	237	53
		(964)	(1078)	(907)			
TOTAL:	2186			.7	236	237	51
INTERMEDIATE							
9	1007	2.6	3.1	.6	236	238	54
		(876)	(924)	(828)			
10	989	3.0	3.6	.6	235	237	56
		(885)	(914)	(834)			
11	748	3.4	4.1	.7	234	237	58
		(677)	(698)	(641)			
TOTAL:	2744			.6	235	237	56
UPPER							
12	668	4.2	5.0	.8 **	237	240	62 **
		(617)	(618)	(585)			
13	633	4.7	5.8	1.1 **	237	242	69 **
		(561)	(595)	(557)			
14	168	4.6	5.7	1.1 **	232	237	75 **
		(148)	(154)	(138)			
TOTAL:	1469			1.0 **	237	241	66 **
ALL PUPILS	6399			.7	236	238	58
				(4618)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
ECLECTIC APPROACH TO READING					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	587	55
	1	M	M	31	6
	2	M	M	42	7
	3	M	M	119	11
	4	M	M	138	4
	5	M	M	159	11
	6	M	M	72	10
	7	M	M	19	6
	8	M	M	7	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	40.9	40.4
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	31.5	40.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (85)
BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES/SULLIVAN READING PROGRAM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	28	1.8 (7)	2.2 (26)	1.0 ** (7)	251	253	57
TOTAL:	28			1.0 **	251	253	57
INTERMEDIATE							
11	21	3.9 (20)	4.8 (20)	1.0 ** (19)	240	245	58
TOTAL:	21			1.0 **	240	245	58
UPPER							
12	24	3.5 (24)	4.0 (24)	.5 (24)	229	230	54
TOTAL:	24			.5	229	230	54
ALL PUPILS	73			.8 (50)	237	239	56

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:	CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
	PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
BRL-SULLIVAN READING PROGRAM				
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:				
TOTAL	M	M	13	M
2	M	M	1	M
3	M	M	4	M
4	M	M	2	M
5	M	M	4	M
6	M	M	2	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:	M	M	41.1	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:	M	M	38.5	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:	46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:	39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:	2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (86)
SCOTT FORESMAN READING SYSTEM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
9	28	2.4	3.0	.6	233	236	61 **
		(28)	(28)	(28)			
10	37	3.1	3.9	.8 **	237	242	70 **
		(34)	(34)	(33)			
11	32	3.1	3.9	.9 **	229	234	77 **
		(31)	(32)	(31)			
TOTAL:	97			.8	233	237	70 **
UPPER							
12	3	2.7	3.5	.8 **	224	229	67 **
		(3)	(3)	(3)			
TOTAL:	3			.8 **	224	229	67 **
ALL PUPILS	100			.8	233	237	69 **
				(95)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (89)
OPEN COURT CORRELATED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	104	1.9 (9)	2.2 (79)	.9 ** (7)	248	249	43
8	65	1.9 (46)	2.3 (48)	.5 (37)	233	231	41
TOTAL:	169			.5	235	234	41
INTERMEDIATE							
9	15	1.8 (12)	2.5 (11)	.8 (9)	223	229	44
10	5	1.4 (3)	1.9 (4)	.8 (3)	210	218	100 **
TOTAL:	20			.9	219	226	58
ALL PUPILS	189			.6 (56)	232	232	45

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
OPEN COURT CORRELATED					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		5	M	99	3
	1	0	M	5	0
	2	0	M	6	1
	3	0	M	14	1
	4	0	M	8	1
	5	1	M	33	0
	6	0	M	24	0
	7	1	M	7	0
	8	2	M	1	0
	9	1	M	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		75.6	M	47.0	28.8
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		100.0	M	49.5	0.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (90)
OPEN COURT REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
8	20	1.7 (13)	2.0 (19)	.5 (13)	230	229	31
TOTAL:	20			.5	230	229	31
INTERMEDIATE							
9	67	2.3 (59)	2.8 (62)	.6 (56)	230	233	62 **
10	80	3.0 (77)	3.6 (75)	.6 (72)	235	237	53
11	103	3.3 (97)	3.9 (96)	.5 (94)	233	234	49
TOTAL:	250			.6	233	235	54
UPPER							
12	47	4.3 (41)	4.8 (44)	.8 (39)	239	241	56
13	30	3.9 (29)	5.1 (27)	1.3 ** (26)	229	235	73 **
14	9	3.8 (9)	4.8 (9)	.8 ** (7)	226	229	71 **
TOTAL:	86			1.0 **	234	238	64 **
ALL PUPILS	356			.7 (307)	233	235	55

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (87)
EMC CORP./SCHMERLER : PHONETIC/LINGUISTIC READING AND LANGUAGE SYSTEM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
8	11	1.9 (9)	2.9 (11)	.8 ** (9)	231	238	56
TOTAL:	11			.8 **	231	238	56
INTERMEDIATE							
9	15	2.7 (14)	3.4 (14)	.6 (13)	238	242	62 **
10	1	2.9 (1)	2.8 (1)	-.1 (1)	241	232	0
11	4	3.8 (4)	4.2 (4)	.4 (4)	242	239	25
TOTAL:	20			.5	239	240	50
UPPER							
12	3	3.7 (3)	4.3 (3)	.6 (3)	231	233	67 **
TOTAL:	3			.6	231	233	67 **
ALL PUPILS	34			.6 (30)	236	239	53

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (98)
BEA COMPREHENSION/VOCABULARY PROGRAM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	19	2.0 (7)	2.4 (13)	.5 ** (3)	246	245	67 **
8	9	2.2 (9)	2.7 (7)	.4 (7)	241	237	43
TOTAL:	28			.5	243	240	50
INTERMEDIATE							
9	25	2.9 (25)	3.6 (23)	.6 (23)	241	244	57
10	17	3.4 (13)	4.0 (16)	.6 (13)	242	242	45
11	20	3.4 (19)	4.4 (18)	1.0 ** (17)	235	240	65 **
TOTAL:	62			.7	239	242	57
UPPER							
12	4	3.4 (4)	4.9 (3)	1.1 ** (3)	233	238	100 **
TOTAL:	4			1.1 **	233	238	100 **
ALL PUPILS	94			.7 (66)	239	242	58

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (84)
SRA CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
9	27	3.1 (25)	3.5 (25)	.4 (23)	244	242	35
10	36	3.2 (35)	3.9 (35)	.7 (34)	240	241	53
11	51	3.6 (43)	4.7 (47)	1.1 ** (45)	237	243	67 **
TOTAL:	114			.8	239	242	55
UPPER							
12	103	3.8 (94)	4.7 (97)	.9 ** (91)	234	238	68 **
13	76	4.4 (68)	5.2 (72)	.9 ** (64)	234	237	64 **
14	18	4.0 (17)	4.8 (17)	.9 ** (16)	226	230	62 **
TOTAL:	197			.9 **	233	237	66 **
ALL PUPILS	311			.9 ** (273)	235	239	62 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (11)
SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR INDIVIDUALIZED READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	61	1.7 (13)	2.5 (45)	.7 (10)	246	243	40
8	38	2.4 (33)	2.9 (36)	.7 (32)	243	244	56
TOTAL:	99			.7	244	243	52
INTERMEDIATE							
9	50	2.5 (42)	2.9 (49)	.4 (42)	234	233	38
10	10	2.5 (8)	2.8 (9)	.4 (7)	230	229	43
11	21	3.7 (20)	4.3 (21)	.7 (20)	238	240	55
TOTAL:	81			.5	235	235	43
UPPER							
12	36	5.2 (35)	5.8 (35)	.6 (35)	249	248	40
13	35	6.2 (33)	6.9 (34)	.7 (32)	252	252	44
14	7	5.4 (7)	6.3 (7)	.9 ** (7)	241	244	57
TOTAL:	78			.7	249	249	43
ALL PUPILS	258			.6 (185)	243	242	45

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR READING					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	46	M
	1	M	M	5	M
	2	M	M	6	M
	3	M	M	12	M
	4	M	M	11	M
	5	M	M	11	M
	6	M	M	1	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	32.6	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	10.9	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (17)
LANGUAGE IN TRANSITION

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	155	1.5 (7)	2.2 (43)	.3 ** (7)	241	240	33
8	151	1.6 (46)	2.2 (77)	.6 (37)	229	230	57
TOTAL:	306			.6	230	231	55
INTERMEDIATE							
9	119	2.1 (33)	2.4 (47)	.6 (27)	226	230	59
10	81	2.2 (32)	2.8 (49)	.7 (30)	223	226	63 **
11	56	3.3 (7)	3.0 (20)	.9 ** (6)	230	235	83 **
TOTAL:	256			.7	225	230	63 **
UPPER							
12	43	2.5 (10)	2.9 (12)	.6 (9)	218	221	67 **
13	54	3.1 (10)	4.4 (15)	1.5 ** (5)	226	235	100 **
14	33	3.6 (4)	3.9 (9)	1.5 ** (4)	221	231	100 **
TOTAL:	130			1.0 **	221	227	83 **
ALL PUPILS	692			.7 (121)	226	230	64 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
LANGUAGE IN TRANSITION					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		25	7	93	17
	1	4	0	11	1
	2	5	0	4	5
	3	10	1	16	1
	4	5	3	32	1
	5	0	0	24	1
	6	1	0	4	5
	7	0	1	2	1
	8	0	2	0	1
	9	0	0	0	1
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		28.7	54.4	36.9	45.6
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		3.8	37.5	18.3	52.9
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (28)
TEACHING READING THROUGH NEWBERY AWARD SERIES

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
11	25	4.6 (21)	5.7 (22)	1.0 ** (20)	249	253	55
TOTAL:	25			1.0 **	249	253	55
UPPER							
12	137	4.8 (131)	5.7 (128)	.9 ** (124)	244	246	61 **
13	201	5.0 (158)	5.8 (195)	.8 ** (186)	240	242	57
14	41	5.2 (37)	5.7 (38)	.6 (35)	236	237	57
TOTAL:	379			.8 **	241	243	59
ALL PUPILS	404			.8 ** (365)	241	243	58

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (25)
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION W/ AUGMENTED STAFFING FOR KG & PRIM LEVELS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	933	1.7	2.2	.9	246	244	50
		(101)	(754)	(98)			
8	997	1.8	2.6	.9 **	232	236	59
		(779)	(924)	(734)			
TOTAL:	1930			.9 **	234	237	58
INTERMEDIATE							
9	419	2.3	2.9	.7	231	235	61 **
		(348)	(387)	(332)			
10	29	1.9	2.9	1.0 **	223	233	87 **
		(27)	(29)	(23)			
TOTAL:	448			.7	231	235	62 **
ALL PUPILS	2378			.8	233	237	59
				(1187)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (25)
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION W/ AUGMENTED STAFFING FOR KG & PRIM LEVELS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE		MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN	
PRIMARY									
7	933	1.6	2.1	.6		244	245	50	
		(105)	(751)	(99)					
8	997	1.8	2.5	.8		236	240	62	**
		(780)	(917)	(729)					
TOTAL:	1930			.8		237	241	60	**
INTERMEDIATE									
9	419	2.3	3.0	.7		238	241	62	**
		(346)	(391)	(333)					
10	29	2.4	3.2	.8	**	236	241	64	**
		(22)	(28)	(22)					
TOTAL:	448			.7		238	241	62	**
ALL PUPILS	2378			.8		237	241	61	**
				(1183)					

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
AUGMENTED STAFFING: PRIMARY					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		486	492	529	421
	1	53	65	60	42
	2	40	30	56	46
	3	77	116	97	58
	4	149	59	131	84
	5	69	74	105	68
	6	64	56	59	73
	7	21	55	13	36
	8	13	13	5	6
	9	0	24	3	8
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		39.9	42.1	37.0	42.0
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		25.0	38.4	25.8	36.6
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (26)
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION W AUGMENTED STAFFING FOR INT & UPPER LEVELS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
9	45	2.2 (35)	2.9 (40)	.7 (34)	239	241	44
TOTAL:	45			.7	239	241	44
INTERMEDIATE							
9	660	2.4 (573)	2.9 (591)	.6 (522)	231	234	56
10	852	2.7 (756)	3.3 (796)	.7 (724)	230	233	59
11	678	3.1 (605)	3.9 (635)	.8 (560)	230	234	64 **
TOTAL:	2190			.7	230	234	60
UPPER							
12	676	3.6 (577)	4.4 (596)	.8 (536)	231	234	62 **
13	514	4.1 (453)	5.1 (460)	1.0 ** (423)	231	235	63 **
14	216	4.3 (193)	5.2 (192)	.9 ** (177)	229	233	69 **
TOTAL:	1406			.9 **	231	234	64 **
ALL PUPILS	3641			.8 (2996)	231	234	61 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (26)
INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION W AUGMENTED STAFFING FOR INT & UPPER LEVELS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
8	45	2.2 (36)	2.8 (40)	.7 (34)	247	248	47
TOTAL:	45			.7	247	248	47
INTERMEDIATE							
9	660	2.5 (577)	3.1 (603)	.6 (539)	239	239	53
10	852	2.9 (741)	3.5 (793)	.6 (707)	237	237	48
11	678	3.3 (609)	4.0 (635)	.8 (578)	234	236	57
TOTAL:	2190			.6	237	237	52
UPPER							
12	676	3.8 (572)	4.5 (590)	.7 (528)	234	235	49
13	514	4.3 (451)	5.2 (457)	.9 ** (418)	232	235	61 **
14	216	4.5 (193)	5.3 (187)	.8 ** (172)	229	233	60 **
TOTAL:	1406			.8	233	235	55
ALL PUPILS	3641			.7 (2976)	235	236	53

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

463

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (84)
ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA'S LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES IN READING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	148	1.7 (6)	2.2 (117)	.5 (6)	245	239	17
8	146	1.8 (120)	2.7 (135)	.9 ** (114)	232	238	58
TOTAL:	294			.9 **	233	238	56
INTERMEDIATE							
9	41	1.9 (34)	2.9 (39)	1.0 ** (34)	224	235	76 **
TOTAL:	41			1.0 **	224	235	76 **
ALL PUPILS	335			.9 ** (154)	231	237	60 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (84)
ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA'S LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES IN READING

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	148	1.5 (5)	2.0 (116)	.4 (5)	241	238	40
8	146	1.9 (115)	2.8 (135)	1.0 ** (110)	239	246	70 **
TOTAL:	294			.9 **	239	246	69 **
INTERMEDIATE							
9	41	1.9 (34)	3.0 (37)	1.0 ** (32)	230	240	84 **
TOTAL:	41			1.0 **	230	240	84 **
ALL PUPILS	335			1.0 ** (147)	237	244	72 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	141	95
	1	M	M	19	11
	2	M	M	17	11
	3	M	M	32	17
	4	M	M	35	18
	5	M	M	26	22
	6	M	M	11	6
	7	M	M	1	7
	8	M	M	0	3
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	32.6	38.7
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	19.0	29.2
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (36)
CRANE READING SYSTEM

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	322	1.7	2.3	.9 **	247	247	48
		(27)	(269)	(23)			
8	327	2.0	2.5	.6	235	236	52
		(253)	(291)	(230)			
TOTAL:	649			.6	236	237	51
INTERMEDIATE							
9	130	2.2	2.6	.5	229	230	47
		(114)	(115)	(103)			
10	4	1.4	2.4	.8 **	221	228	50
		(3)	(3)	(2)			
TOTAL:	134			.5	229	230	47
ALL PUPILS	783			.6	234	235	50
				(359)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (35)
CRANE READING SYSTEM

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	322	1.6 (27)	2.1 (271)	.6 (23)	241	248	61 **
8	327	1.9 (254)	2.5 (292)	.7 (232)	238	240	55
TOTAL:	649			.7	238	241	55
INTERMEDIATE							
9	130	2.2 (114)	2.8 (116)	.6 (103)	235	236	56
10	4	1.5 (3)	2.3 (4)	1.1 ** (3)	219	231	100 **
TOTAL:	134			.6	234	236	58
ALL PUPILS	783			.6 (361)	237	239	56

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
CRANE READING SYSTEM					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		156	112	199	170
	1	8	13	14	7
	2	11	8	17	21
	3	28	24	40	24
	4	34	17	55	41
	5	21	16	48	26
	6	18	12	23	29
	7	18	16	2	17
	8	12	4	0	4
	9	6	2	0	1
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		47.1	43.1	38.0	43.9
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		40.9	40.4	23.6	36.5
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (15)
DISTAR PROGRAM IN READING AND LANGUAGE

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	290	1.7 (7)	2.3 (256)	.9 ** (7)	245	246	71 **
8	181	2.2 (142)	2.9 (163)	.9 ** (131)	239	243	59
TOTAL:	471			.8 **	239	243	59
INTERMEDIATE							
9	80	2.6 (67)	3.4 (71)	.3 ** (62)	237	243	66 **
10	5	2.1 (5)	4.0 (5)	1.9 ** (5)	226	250	100 **
TOTAL:	85			.9 **	237	244	69 **
ALL PUPILS	556			.8 ** (205)	238	243	62 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (15)
DISTAR PROGRAM IN READING AND LANGUAGE

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	290	1.7 (8)	2.0 (255)	.8 ** (8)	247	254	62 **
8	181	1.9 (142)	2.6 (161)	.9 ** (131)	237	244	65 **
TOTAL:	471			.9 **	238	245	65 **
INTERMEDIATE							
9	80	2.3 (66)	3.4 (71)	1.1 ** (61)	239	247	75 **
10	5	3.1 (5)	4.1 (4)	.9 ** (4)	253	255	50
TOTAL:	85			1.0 **	240	247	74 **
ALL PUPILS	556			.9 ** (204)	238	245	68 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
DISTAR					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		137	141	276	159
	1	10	4	17	25
	2	11	11	18	20
	3	14	18	44	22
	4	37	17	54	21
	5	26	28	85	25
	6	15	17	44	24
	7	14	33	10	18
	8	8	5	3	4
	9	2	8	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		45.4	52.2	42.7	39.3
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		38.7	56.7	37.2	38.7
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
EARLY INTERVENTION					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		271	205	5	M
	1	8	20	1	M
	2	12	13	1	M
	3	44	49	1	M
	4	100	31	2	M
	5	44	39	0	M
	6	29	19	0	M
	7	15	26	0	M
	8	15	4	0	M
	9	4	4	0	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		44.8	41.8	25.1	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		30.7	35.2	0.0	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (65)
INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM SCHOOLS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	372	1.9	2.3	.9 **	249	249	45
		(93)	(314)	(91)			
8	535	2.1	2.6	.6	237	237	48
		(422)	(481)	(398)			
TOTAL:	907			.7	239	240	47
INTERMEDIATE							
9	283	2.3	2.9	.7	230	235	58
		(252)	(249)	(228)			
10	199	3.0	3.5	.5	235	235	48
		(180)	(163)	(172)			
11	146	3.3	3.9	.6	233	235	56
		(135)	(139)	(130)			
TOTAL:	628			.6	233	235	54
UPPER							
12	216	4.3	5.3	1.0 **	239	243	60
		(192)	(199)	(162)			
13	202	4.9	6.2	1.3 **	239	245	64 **
		(185)	(191)	(177)			
14	130	4.7	6.1	1.4 **	232	241	76 **
		(115)	(119)	(110)			
TOTAL:	548			1.2 **	238	243	65 **
ALL PUPILS	2083			.8 **	236	239	56
				(1468)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (65)
INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM SCHOOLS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	372	1.5 (95)	2.1 (314)	.8 ** (90)	242	250	79 **
8	535	1.9 (419)	2.5 (475)	.7 (391)	239	241	56
TOTAL:	907			.7	240	243	59
INTERMEDIATE							
9	283	2.2 (249)	2.9 (251)	.7 (227)	235	238	61 **
10	199	3.1 (179)	3.6 (181)	.5 (170)	240	238	42
11	146	3.5 (135)	4.2 (136)	.7 (128)	237	237	54
TOTAL:	628			.6	237	238	53
UPPER							
12	216	4.2 (194)	5.0 (197)	.9 ** (162)	238	240	57
13	202	4.8 (179)	5.9 (186)	1.1 ** (167)	237	243	72 **
14	130	4.7 (108)	5.9 (112)	1.3 ** (102)	230	238	72 **
TOTAL:	548			1.0 **	236	241	66 **
ALL PUPILS	2093			.8 (1457)	238	240	59

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM SCHOOLS					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	121	122
	1	M	M	9	17
	2	M	M	6	21
	3	M	M	33	27
	4	M	M	26	22
	5	M	M	32	19
	6	M	M	12	11
	7	M	M	2	4
	8	M	M	1	0
	9	M	M	0	1
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	38.8	33.9
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	23.1	24.6
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
CHILD:PARENT CENTERS					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		794	819	M	M
	1	25	55	M	M
	2	18	33	M	M
	3	85	109	M	M
	4	178	93	M	M
	5	145	159	M	M
	6	145	97	M	M
	7	74	173	M	M
	8	70	43	M	M
	9	54	57	M	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		53.1	52.3	M	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		51.0	55.5	M	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (37)
FOLLOW THROUGH

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	338	2.5	2.9	.4	263	252	33
		(15)	(289)	(12)			
8	314	2.8	3.3	.6	250	248	43
		(260)	(285)	(244)			
TOTAL:	652			.5	250	249	43
INTERMEDIATE							
9	28	2.9	3.2	.3	252	247	29
		(21)	(24)	(17)			
TOTAL:	28			.3	252	247	29
ALL PUPILS	680			.5	251	249	42
				(273)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (37)
FOLLOW THROUGH

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	338	2.2 (13)	2.4 (267)	.8 ** (10)	260	267	70 **
8	314	2.4 (257)	3.2 (286)	.7 (242)	253	253	52
TOTAL:	652			.7	253	253	52
INTERMEDIATE							
9	28	2.4 (20)	3.0 (24)	.8 (17)	249	250	47
TOTAL:	28			.8	249	250	47
ALL PUPILS	680			.7 (269)	253	253	52

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
FOLLOW THROUGH					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		224	226	223	226
	1	2	8	10	7
	2	4	8	6	10
	3	23	23	14	21
	4	64	29	29	29
	5	46	50	56	39
	6	45	26	51	46
	7	20	51	36	36
	8	12	13	15	22
	9	8	18	6	16
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		50.6	54.5	54.0	56.1
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		44.7	60.9	62.8	65.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

```
                 1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
                          ACTIVITY ( 3)
            COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION - MATHEMATICS

                         ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/  PUPILS          GRADE                MATCHED CHICAGO  % HAVING
AGE    REPORTED      EQUIVALENT                NCE SCORES     POSITIVE
          IN                                                  STANDARD
        TITLE I  PRE-  POST- GAIN             PRE-  POST-      SCORE
        ACTIVITY TEST  TEST  SCORE            TEST  TEST       GAIN

PRIMARY

   7       1           NO TEST DATA COULD BE LOCATED

   8      34     2.2   3.0   .8 **            245   249         56
               (  26)(  33)(  25)

TOTAL:    35                 .8 **            245   249         56

INTERMEDIATE

   9     597     2.9   3.5   .7               247   247         52
               ( 524)( 542)( 488)

  10    1028     3.4   4.0   .6               245   243         44
               ( 915)( 940)( 864)

  11    1268     4.0   4.7   .8               243   244         52
               (1139)(1153)(1083)

TOTAL:  2893                 .7               245   244         49

UPPER

  12     972     4.4   5.2   .8 **            240   242         52
               ( 863)( 896)( 823)

  13     505     4.8   5.8   .9 **            238   242         62 **
               ( 465)( 458)( 430)

  14     225     4.8   5.6   .8 **            232   236         63 **
               ( 196)( 210)( 191)

TOTAL:  1702                 .9 **            239   241         57

 ALL
PUPILS  4630                 .7               242   243         52
                           ( 3904)

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES
```

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
DISTRICT 14 UNIT 6863 DULLES

ACTIVITY (36)
AUDIO-TUTORIAL LABORATORY FOR INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS : MATHEMATICS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
	TITLE I ACTIVITY	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
INTERMEDIATE							
9	7	2.7	3.9	1.2 **	242	252	85 **
		(7)	(7)	(7)			
10	28	2.9	3.5	.6	235	237	62 **
		(28)	(26)	(26)			
11	27	3.9	5.0	1.2 **	242	247	84 **
		(25)	(26)	(25)			
TOTAL:	62			1.0 **	237	243	79 **
UPPER							
12	2	3.3	4.2	.8 **	231	237	100 **
		(2)	(2)	(2)			
TOTAL:	2			.8 **	231	237	100 **
ALL PUPILS	64			1.0 **	237	243	75 **
				(60)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (5)
SYSTEM 80 PROGRAM - MATHEMATICS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	59	1.4	1.7	.5	238	237	50
		(10)	(43)	(10)			
8	115	2.0	2.6	.7	242	244	58
		(77)	(99)	(69)			
TOTAL:	174			.7	241	243	57
INTERMEDIATE							
9	34	2.1	3.0	1.0 **	232	241	76 **
		(27)	(32)	(25)			
10	21	3.0	3.9	1.0 **	239	243	76 **
		(17)	(20)	(17)			
11	28	3.3	4.0	.7	234	235	57
		(24)	(24)	(23)			
TOTAL:	83			.9 **	234	239	69 **
UPPER							
12	20	3.3	4.3	1.0 **	228	233	60
		(20)	(20)	(20)			
13	21	3.6	4.3	.7	224	227	55
		(20)	(20)	(20)			
14	2	3.9	4.6	.7	222	225	50
		(2)	(2)	(2)			
TOTAL:	43			.9 **	226	229	57
ALL PUPILS	300			.8	235	239	61 **
				(186)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
SYSTEM 80: MATHEMATICS					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		7	1	56	16
	1	0	0	2	2
	2	1	1	2	4
	3	0	0	11	2
	4	3	0	19	3
	5	3	0	13	4
	6	0	0	8	0
	7	0	0	1	1
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		41.4	18.5	41.5	32.9
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		14.3	0.0	23.2	12.5
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (2)
PRESCRIPTION LEARNING - MATHEMATICS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	68	1.7	2.4	.8 **	248	256	68 **
		(35)	(77)	(34)			
8	170	2.3	3.1	.8 **	250	252	55
		(145)	(151)	(132)			
TOTAL:	258			.8 **	249	253	53
INTERMEDIATE							
9	306	2.6	3.4	.8	242	244	59
		(267)	(273)	(248)			
10	367	3.4	4.2	.8	245	246	51
		(347)	(363)	(332)			
11	366	3.8	4.7	.9 **	241	243	58
		(352)	(365)	(339)			
TOTAL:	1079			.8 **	243	244	55
UPPER							
12	467	4.6	5.5	.9 **	243	244	56
		(459)	(461)	(435)			
13	437	5.0	6.0	1.0 **	240	244	67 **
		(403)	(410)	(388)			
14	137	4.9	5.7	.8	233	236	62 **
		(119)	(122)	(108)			
TOTAL:	1061			.9 **	240	243	61 **
ALL PUPILS	2398			.9 **	242	245	58
				(2016)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (93)
HIGH INTENSITY CENTERS - MATHEMATICS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
INTERMEDIATE							
9	27	2.8	3.9	1.0 **	245	251	71 **
		(25)	(24)	(24)			
10	41	3.7	4.8	1.1 **	249	253	76 **
		(39)	(39)	(37)			
11	4	3.5	4.8	1.2 **	246	252	75 **
		(4)	(4)	(4)			
TOTAL:	72			1.1 **	247	252	74 **
ALL PUPILS	72			1.1 **	247	252	74 **
				(65)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (59)
MATHEMATICS LABORATORY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL SKILLS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	1	2.0 (1)	3.3 (1)	1.3 ** (1)	241	274	100 **
8	132	2.1 (119)	2.9 (123)	.8 (112)	245	247	53
TOTAL:	133			.9	245	248	53
INTERMEDIATE							
9	251	2.7 (223)	3.5 (233)	.9 ** (211)	243	246	57
10	274	3.4 (247)	4.2 (245)	.9 ** (226)	244	247	63
11	246	3.9 (224)	4.8 (234)	.9 ** (213)	242	245	62 **
TOTAL:	771			.9 **	243	246	58
UPPER							
12	184	4.5 (172)	5.4 (174)	.9 ** (165)	242	243	55
13	168	5.2 (153)	6.2 (158)	1.0 ** (146)	241	246	67 **
14	37	4.9 (33)	5.7 (35)	.7 (32)	235	237	56
TOTAL:	389			.9 **	241	244	60 **
ALL PUPILS	1293			.9 ** (1111)	243	245	58

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (63)
ALTERNATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MATHEMATICS SYSTEM

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
9	2	3.5 (2)	4.4 (2)	.9 ** (2)	259	260	50
10	35	3.4 (32)	4.3 (33)	.9 ** (32)	244	247	62 **
11	99	4.2 (94)	5.0 (93)	.8 (91)	246	246	47
TOTAL:	136			.8 **	246	247	51
UPPER							
12	157	4.7 (140)	5.6 (144)	1.0 ** (140)	243	245	59
13	147	5.2 (138)	6.3 (135)	1.1 ** (131)	241	246	73 **
14	42	5.2 (40)	6.2 (40)	1.0 ** (38)	237	242	74 **
TOTAL:	346			1.0 **	241	245	67 **
ALL PUPILS	482			1.0 ** (434)	243	246	62 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (55)
INDIVIDUALIZED MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION: ECLECTIC

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
8	3	1.8	4.1	1.5 **	239	257	100 **
		(2)	(2)	(1)			
TOTAL:	3			1.5 **	239	257	100 **
INTERMEDIATE							
9	167	2.6	3.6	1.0 **	242	248	70 **
		(152)	(156)	(143)			
10	263	3.0	4.0	.9 **	239	243	64 **
		(237)	(245)	(227)			
11	144	3.7	4.5	.9 **	239	241	58
		(130)	(134)	(127)			
TOTAL:	574			.9 **	240	244	64 **
UPPER							
12	91	4.4	5.1	.8 **	240	241	48
		(80)	(61)	(75)			
13	53	4.3	5.4	1.0 **	234	236	64 **
		(52)	(48)	(47)			
14	24	4.2	4.8	.8 **	224	229	75 **
		(17)	(19)	(16)			
TOTAL:	168			.9 **	236	239	57
ALL PUPILS	745			.9 **	239	243	63 **
				(636)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (56)
INDIVIDUALIZED MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION: WYNROTH

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE- TEST	POST- TEST	
PRIMARY							
7	16	1.7 (2)	2.1 (11)	1.0 ** (1)	244	256	100 **
8	9	1.9 (7)	2.3 (7)	.6 (5)	238	238	40
TOTAL:	25			.6	239	241	50
INTERMEDIATE							
9	17	1.9 (17)	3.1 (17)	1.1 ** (17)	229	240	100 **
10	14	2.2 (13)	2.8 (12)	.6 (11)	226	227	64 **
11	13	2.6 (11)	3.9 (13)	1.3 ** (11)	225	233	91 **
TOTAL:	44			1.0 **	227	235	87 **
UPPER							
12	3	2.1 (3)	2.9 (2)	.9 ** (2)	212	216	100 **
TOTAL:	3			.9 **	212	216	100 **
ALL PUPILS	72			1.0 ** (47)	228	235	83 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
IMI:WYNROTH MATHEMATICS					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	M	5
	8	M	M	M	1
	9	M	M	M	4
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	M	94.1
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	M	100.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (66)
PRE-ALGEBRA DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
UPPER							
12	76	4.7	5.4	.7	243	243	46
		(72)	(70)	(70)			
13	144	5.5	6.4	.9 **	245	248	55
		(136)	(129)	(125)			
14	29	5.2	6.2	.9 **	236	242	71 **
		(26)	(26)	(24)			
TOTAL:	249			.9 **	243	245	54
ALL PUPILS	249			.9 **	243	245	54
				(219)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (21)
CAREER GUIDANCE LABORATORY

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
PRIMARY							
7	44	1.6 (19)	2.2 (40)	1.1 ** (19)	244	249	47
8	14	1.4 (10)	2.5 (14)	.9 ** (10)	226	232	60
TOTAL:	58			1.0 **	236	243	52
INTERMEDIATE							
9	19	2.4 (12)	2.8 (15)	.3 (10)	234	232	30
10	24	3.5 (23)	4.3 (21)	.7 (20)	245	246	60
11	36	3.7 (35)	4.6 (36)	1.0 ** (35)	239	243	69 **
TOTAL:	78			.8	240	242	60
UPPER							
12	37	5.0 (34)	6.1 (36)	1.1 ** (33)	248	252	67 **
13	43	5.5 (40)	6.6 (41)	1.1 ** (40)	245	249	65 **
14	17	5.3 (17)	5.9 (16)	1.0 ** (13)	237	241	77 **
TOTAL:	97			1.1 **	245	249	67 **
ALL PUPILS	233			1.0 ** (180)	242	246	62 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (21)
CAREER GUIDANCE LABORATORY

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	44	1.5 (19)	2.5 (39)	1.6 ** (19)	243	271	89 **
8	14	1.4 (11)	2.9 (14)	1.4 ** (11)	229	250	91 **
TOTAL:	58			1.6 **	237	263	90 **
INTERMEDIATE							
9	18	2.4 (13)	3.0 (14)	.5 (9)	243	241	44
10	24	3.5 (23)	4.3 (21)	.9 ** (20)	245	247	50
11	36	4.0 (34)	4.8 (36)	.8 ** (34)	244	245	59
TOTAL:	78			.8	244	245	54
UPPER							
12	37	5.2 (34)	6.3 (36)	1.1 ** (33)	251	254	45
13	43	5.9 (40)	6.7 (41)	.8 ** (40)	248	250	57
14	17	5.5 (13)	6.3 (16)	1.1 ** (13)	238	244	92 **
TOTAL:	97			.9 **	248	250	58
ALL PUPILS	233			1.0 ** (179)	245	251	62 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

```
                    1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
                              ACTIVITY (52)
                     INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORIES: ART

                       ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/  PUPILS          GRADE                  MATCHED CHICAGO   % HAVING
AGE     REPORTED      EQUIVALENT                NCE SCORES       POSITIVE
          IN                                                     STANDARD
        TITLE I  PRE-   POST- GAIN              PRE-   POST-      SCORE
        ACTIVITY TEST   TEST  SCORE             TEST   TEST        GAIN

PRIMARY

    7     154     2.1    2.2    .4              256    245          22
               (  37)( 117)(  32)

    8     251     2.1    2.8    .7              236    240          54
               ( 200)( 233)( 191)

TOTAL:    405                   .6              241    240          49

INTERMEDIATE

    9     279     2.7    3.3    .6              238    241          57
               ( 245)( 263)( 234)

   10     252     3.4    4.0    .6              242    242          52
               ( 230)( 246)( 227)

   11     241     4.2    4.9    .8 **           244    246          59
               ( 211)( 223)( 200)

TOTAL:    772                   .7              242    243          56

UPPER

   12     229     4.2    5.2   1.1 **           236    243          69 **
               ( 205)( 212)( 198)

   13     137     4.5    5.9   1.5 **           235    243          80 **
               ( 125)( 132)( 123)

   14      60     4.7    5.9   1.2 **           232    238          73 **
               (  51)(  56)(  49)

TOTAL:    426                  1.2 **           236    242          74 **

 ALL
PUPILS   1603                   .8 **           240    242          60 **
                             ( 1254)

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES
```

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (53)
INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORIES: SCIENCE

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE- TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST- TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE- TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST- TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	211	1.6	2.5	1.0 **	245	248	53
		(52)	(167)	(49)			
8	385	2.4	2.9	.6	242	242	49
		(339)	(354)	(321)			
TOTAL:	596			.6	243	243	49
INTERMEDIATE							
9	561	2.5	3.1	.6	235	237	57
		(498)	(515)	(468)			
10	488	3.0	3.6	.6	235	236	54
		(443)	(451)	(419)			
11	361	3.5	4.3	.8	236	239	63 **
		(325)	(339)	(312)			
TOTAL:	1410			.6	235	237	57
UPPER							
12	436	4.3	5.0	.8	239	241	57
		(397)	(401)	(378)			
13	382	5.1	6.2	1.1 **	241	245	63 **
		(342)	(361)	(333)			
14	116	4.7	5.7	1.0 **	232	237	67 **
		(104)	(110)	(101)			
TOTAL:	934			.9 **	239	242	61 **
ALL PUPILS	2940			.7	238	240	57
				(2381)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (54)
INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORIES: CREATIVE ARTS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
PRIMARY							
7	54	2.0 (31)	2.4 (47)	.4 (30)	252	242	33
8	82	2.2 (76)	3.0 (77)	.8 ** (67)	240	245	60
TOTAL:	136			.7	244	244	52
INTERMEDIATE							
9	111	2.5 (104)	3.1 (103)	.6 (97)	234	236	54
10	121	2.9 (114)	3.5 (116)	.6 (111)	234	235	55
11	82	3.5 (76)	4.3 (79)	.8 (73)	235	238	64 **
TOTAL:	314			.6	234	236	57
UPPER							
12	30	4.2 (27)	4.7 (29)	.6 (27)	239	239	43
13	25	4.7 (24)	6.1 (23)	1.3 ** (23)	238	244	83 **
14	2	3.4 (2)	4.7 (2)	1.3 ** (2)	221	230	100 **
TOTAL:	57			.9 **	237	241	65 **
ALL PUPILS	507			.7 (430)	237	239	57

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

```
               1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
                         ACTIVITY (64)
         BILINGUAL EDUCATION MULTIMEDIA INSTRUCTION

                   ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/  PUPILS          GRADE                MATCHED CHICAGO   % HAVING
AGE    REPORTED      EQUIVALENT               NCE SCORES       POSITIVE
          IN                                                   STANDARD
        TITLE I  PRE-   POST- GAIN            PRE-   POST-      SCORE
        ACTIVITY TEST   TEST  SCORE           TEST   TEST       GAIN

PRIMARY

     7       25      1.5    1.9    1.1 **       241    246         67 **
                   (   3)(  25)(   3)

     8       25      1.9    2.2     .6          231    232         60
                   (  11)(  12)(  10)

TOTAL:       50                     .7          233    235         62 **

INTERMEDIATE

     9       23      1.7    2.6     .6          226    230         71 **
                   (  11)(   7)(   7)

    10        3      2.1    2.5     .5          218    221         50
                   (   3)(   2)(   2)

TOTAL:       26                     .6          226    228         67 **

 ALL
PUPILS       76                     .7          230    232         64 **
                                (  22)

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES
```

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (64)
BILINGUAL EDUCATION MULTIMEDIA INSTRUCTION

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	25	1.1 (3)	2.0 (25)	1.9 ** (3)	232	266	100 **
8	25	1.8 (10)	2.4 (12)	.7 (9)	238	241	67 **
TOTAL:	50			1.0 **	236	247	75 **
INTERMEDIATE							
9	23	1.9 (10)	3.0 (7)	.9 ** (7)	234	241	57
10	3	1.4 (3)	2.6 (2)	1.3 ** (2)	211	225	100 **
TOTAL:	26			1.0 **	229	237	67 **
ALL PUPILS	76			1.0 ** (21)	233	243	71 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
BILINGUAL MULTIMEDIAINST.					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	17	M
	3	M	M	3	M
	4	M	M	5	M
	5	M	M	7	M
	6	M	M	2	M
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	46.5	M
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	52.9	M
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (16)
BASIC OCCUPATIONAL AND SKILL TRAINING

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
UPPER							
12	13	4.1 (12)	4.5 (11)	.3 (11)	238	236	36
13	146	4.3 (130)	5.4 (126)	1.0 ** (115)	233	237	64 **
14	312	4.3 (270)	5.0 (261)	.8 (235)	227	230	69 **
TOTAL:	471			.9 **	230	233	66 **
ALL PUPILS	471			.9 ** (361)	230	233	66 **

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1982 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (16)
BASIC OCCUPATIONAL AND SKILL TRAINING

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
UPPER							
12	13	4.1	4.9	.6	239	236	50
		(13)	(10)	(10)			
13	146	4.6	5.4	.8 **	235	238	61 **
		(123)	(123)	(111)			
14	312	4.5	5.1	.7	228	230	62 **
		(269)	(252)	(225)			
TOTAL:	471			.7	230	233	62 **
ALL PUPILS	471			.7	230	233	62 **
				(346)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
PARENT PLUS PROJECT					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		M	M	34	34
	1	M	M	8	11
	2	M	M	6	4
	3	M	M	2	6
	4	M	M	3	5
	5	M	M	7	5
	6	M	M	4	3
	7	M	M	2	0
	8	M	M	1	0
	9	M	M	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		M	M	37.5	26.6
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		M	M	38.2	17.6
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5 PRE-READING	MATH	CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6 READING	MATH
PARENT INVOLVEMENT					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		21	21	79	19
	1	0	0	7	0
	2	0	0	7	0
	3	0	1	12	2
	4	1	2	15	4
	5	4	6	25	2
	6	5	1	9	4
	7	5	10	3	3
	8	4	1	1	1
	9	2	0	0	3
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		68.3	60.4	40.0	60.1
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		95.2	71.4	36.7	63.2
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (9)
STAFF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH A LOCAL SCHOOL READING RESOURCE SPECIALIST

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT			MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES		% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
		PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	
PRIMARY							
7	34	.0	1.7				
		(0)	(28)				
9	12	2.6	2.7	.2	249	241	22
		(9)	(10)	(9)			
TOTAL:	46			.2	249	241	22
INTERMEDIATE							
9	10	2.2	2.7	.5	230	231	22
		(9)	(10)	(9)			
10	48	3.0	3.8	.8 **	235	240	62 **
		(45)	(48)	(45)			
11	58	3.0	3.7	.6	230	232	57
		(53)	(58)	(53)			
TOTAL:	116			.7	232	235	56
UPPER							
12	64	4.1	5.1	1.0 **	236	240	60
		(59)	(60)	(57)			
13	89	4.7	5.5	.9	238	239	51
		(62)	(81)	(76)			
14	37	4.7	5.7	1.0 **	232	237	75 **
		(36)	(37)	(36)			
TOTAL:	190			.9 **	236	239	59
ALL PUPILS	352			.8	235	238	57
				(285)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (41)
NEW EDUCATIONAL DIRECTIONS

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST-TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
INTERMEDIATE							
10	4	3.0	4.3	1.4 **	237	249	100 **
		(3)	(4)	(3)			
11	5	5.0	5.7	1.6 **	255	264	100 **
		(3)	(4)	(3)			
TOTAL:	9			1.5 **	246	256	100 **
UPPER							
12	7	4.5	5.7	1.2 **	242	247	86 **
		(7)	(7)	(7)			
14	1	NO TEST DATA COULD BE LOCATED					
TOTAL:	8			1.2 **	242	247	86 **
ALL PUPILS	17			1.3 **	244	251	92 **
				(13)			

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (49)
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

ITBS READING COMPREHENSION

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	GAIN SCORE	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE-TEST	POST-TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN
PRIMARY							
7	95	1.6 (14)	2.0 (79)	.9 ** (9)	242	243	56
8	139	2.6 (118)	2.7 (128)	.3 (111)	246	239	39
TOTAL:	234			.3	245	240	40
INTERMEDIATE							
9	189	2.5 (163)	3.1 (168)	.6 (151)	235	237	58
10	104	3.2 (94)	3.8 (95)	.5 (89)	240	240	47
11	95	3.5 (83)	4.3 (87)	.8 (73)	236	239	56
TOTAL:	388			.6	236	238	54
UPPER							
12	124	4.2 (116)	5.1 (113)	.9 ** (112)	237	240	59
13	158	4.9 (148)	6.1 (144)	1.2 ** (136)	239	245	68 **
14	54	4.4 (48)	5.8 (47)	1.3 ** (45)	230	237	78 **
TOTAL:	336			1.1 **	237	242	66 **
ALL PUPILS	958			.8 (731)	238	240	57

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

1980 TITLE I ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS
ACTIVITY (49)
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

ITBS MATH TOTAL

LEVEL/ AGE	PUPILS REPORTED IN TITLE I ACTIVITY	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE- TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT POST- TEST	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN SCORE		MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES PRE- TEST	MATCHED CHICAGO NCE SCORES POST- TEST	% HAVING POSITIVE STANDARD SCORE GAIN	
PRIMARY									
7	95	1.5	1.8	.6		242	243	54	
		(14)	(88)	(13)					
8	139	2.2	2.8	.7		247	247	48	
		(115)	(129)	(109)					
TOTAL:	234			.7		246	247	48	
INTERMEDIATE									
9	189	2.6	3.2	.6		242	242	51	
		(162)	(169)	(151)					
10	104	3.1	3.9	.8	**	241	243	59	
		(91)	(95)	(66)					
11	95	3.8	4.5	.8		241	242	54	
		(83)	(87)	(78)					
TOTAL:	388			.7		241	242	54	
UPPER									
12	124	4.4	5.2	.8		240	240	53	
		(116)	(111)	(110)					
13	158	5.1	6.1	1.0	**	240	244	60	**
		(149)	(142)	(134)					
14	54	4.7	5.8	1.0	**	233	237	69	**
		(48)	(47)	(45)					
TOTAL:	336			.9	**	239	242	59	
ALL PUPILS	958			.8		241	243	55	
				(726)					

** INDICATES CRITERIA FOR ACTIVITY WERE MET
NUMBER OF PUPILS ON WHICH AVERAGES ARE BASED APPEAR IN PARENTHESES

RESULTS OF THE MAY 1980 COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

ACTIVITY:		CTBS-A ---- AGE CYCLE 5		CTBS-B ---- AGE CYCLE 6	
		PRE-READING	MATH	READING	MATH
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP INST.					
NUMBER OF PUPILS PER STANINE:					
TOTAL		15	M	21	6
	1	1	M	2	0
	2	1	M	2	0
	3	7	M	3	0
	4	4	M	2	3
	5	2	M	11	3
	6	0	M	1	0
AVERAGE STANDARD SCORE:		32.3	M	39.6	46.2
PERCENT ABOVE NATIONAL MEAN:		13.3	M	23.8	50.0
THE NATIONAL STANDARD SCORE AVERAGE WAS:		50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
THE MEAN FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS WAS:		46.5	48.6	40.4	43.2
FOR CHICAGO TITLE I PUPILS, THE PERCENT ABOVE THE NATIONAL MEAN WAS:		39.7	51.3	31.3	40.2
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS TESTED WITH THE CTBS IN CHICAGO WAS:		2256	2002	2719	1325